GENEALOGICAL NOTES

DESCENDANTS

OF

THOMAS BROWNE

OF

CONCORD, MASS.

BY

GOODWIN BROWN, ESQ.

OF YONKERS, N. Y.

1901

NEW YORK:
MARTIN B. BROWN COMPANY, PRINTERS
49-57 PARK PLACE

DESCENDANTS

OF

THOMAS BROWNE,

Of CONCORD, Mass.

The following records were revised and certified by Mr. George Tolman, of Concord, Mass., May 28, 1896. Mr. Tolman is regarded as an authority by the Concord Library. Among other things, he says:

"I have consulted, in making my tracing of the Concord Browns, only the original sources of information, that is, the municipal registers and records of Concord and Cambridge, etc.; the wills, administrations, partitions of estates, etc., in the probate registry; the deeds and mortgages recorded in the county register of deeds; the records of the civil courts and the like, and the vital records of any other town or county to which any of the things appear to point. The records are often quite imperfect and some inferences have to be drawn—for instance, there is no record of the birth of Thomas, 2d, to prove that he was the son of Thomas, or that he was born in 1651; but as long as the first Thomas is alive the other is always called Thomas, Jr., in the tax lists and such like documents; he inherits a large share of the lands of the first Thomas, and his gravestone shows that he must have been born in 1651. I am very shy of using printed genealogical works, and when I do find myself obliged to depend upon them from inability to get at the original record, I always quote their authority.

"There seems not to be room for much amplifying of the typewritten record you sent, and which I return herewith. Some of the dates given merely in years can be filled out from the printed records which are accessible to you, and I can from my own manuscript genealogy of the family fill out any of the lines you may wish to follow."

Mr. Tolman also writes as follows, under date of January 19, 1897:

"You asked if Rev. Edmund Brown's will stated explicitly that he and Thomas were brothers. It does not, but they are many times referred to as such in the old records of Sudbury—lived in the same house at the first—and all tradition of the places makes the fact practically certain. Edmund in his will bequeaths his lands and housing at Bury St. Edmunds to relatives who had remained in Old England, which shows that he came from there, though not necessarily that he was *born* there. I will endeavor to get full copy of will if you so desire. I do not know of any Ephraim Brown, other than your great grandfather who could have been in Temple, N. H., and of military age in the revolutionary war."

See also "Potter's Old Families of Concord," pages 7 and 64, and other references, where the genealogy is carefuly traced.

References are made to the Concord Register of Births, Marriages and Deaths, 1635–1850, unless otherwise stated.

I have not examined the Massachusetts colonial records as they are not yet printed.

For Edmund Brown, see "Quincy's History of Harvard University," volume 1, page 419.

The name Brown has a final "e," as shown by all the early records. For convenience, the ordinary spelling is given.

THOMAS BROWN, born ————————, in Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, England. This is shown by the will of Rev. Edmund Brown in Middlesex probate registry. The Rev. Edmund Brown was a brother of Thomas. They came to New England together in 1637. The two brothers were among the original proprietors of Sudbury, Mass., where Edmund was the first minister of the church in town, and is now stated to have been one of the most distinguished clergymen of the time (see "Mather's Magnalia, Hudson's History of Sudbury," p. 35; "Savage's Genealogical Dictionary" and "Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit").

In the "Annals of Sudbury, Wayland & Maynard," published in 1891, page 5, it appears that the Town of Sudbury was named by the Rev. Edmund Brown. "The name ordered by the court is that of an old English town, in the County of Suffolk, near the parish of Bury St. Edmunds, at or near which place it is supposed the Browns may have dwelt. It is not improbable that the name was given by Rev. Edmund Brown, the first minister of Sudbury, who sold lands in the district of Lanham to Thomas Read, his nephew, and he, it is supposed, may have also named that locality from Lavenham, Eng., a place between Sudbury and

Bury St. Edmunds. The place, though spelled Lavenham, is pronounced Lanham, in England (Waters). The proximity of Sudbury and Lavenham to what was probably the original home of Mr. Brown, together with the fact that he was an early owner of the lands at Lanham, and a prominent man at the settlement, affords at least a strong presumption that Mr. Edmund Brown named both Sudbury and Lanham."

In the same work, page 18, the following appears in relation to the Rev. Edmund Brown:

He "came from England in 1637, and according to Mather was ordained and in actual service in that country before he came to America. He was a Freeman of Massachusetts Bay Colony, May 13, 1640. He married about 1645 Ann, widow of John Loveren, of Watertown, but left no children. He was a member of the Synod that established the 'Cambridge Platform,' 1646–1648; was on the council that met in 1657 to settle difficulties in the Rev. Mr. Stone's church, Hartford; preached the artillery election sermon in 1666, and was preacher to the company in 1666, and his name is attached to the testimony of the seventeen ministers against the proceedings of the three elders of the first church of Boston about 1669. Mr. Brown was quite a land owner, his real estate, as it is supposed, amounting to 300 acres. His library was for those times quite valuable, containing about 180 volumes. He left fifty pounds to establish a grammar school in Sudbury; he also left one hundred pounds to Harvard College."

In a map of the first roads and house lots in Sudbury, page 38, appear the house lots of Thomas Brown and Edmund Brown.

Page 63, Edmund Brown is referred to again as "a scholarly and substantial minister, as well as an honored and useful citizen."

In the "Early History of Middlesex County," by Drake, Boston, 1880, volume 2, page 468, it appears that Edmund Brown "was of those who were in the actual exercise of the ministry when he left England. Johnson speaks of him as 'a godly and able minister of the Word.' He was much honored in social life, being on terms of intimacy with the family of Governer Leverett. He was a member of the Synod that established the Cambridge Platform, 1646–1648, and was on the Council that met October, 1657, to settle the difficulties in Rev. Mr. Stone's church, at Hartford. Besides large grants as an original proprietor of Sudbury, he received from the General Court several meadows in Framingham. His landed estates, acquired, and by gift and purchase, could not have been less than 300 acres.

His house, called in his will 'Brunswick,' that is, 'House by the Stream,' was of ample dimensions, two stories high, and well furnished."

THOMAS BROWN came to Concord in 1640. He had there a wife, Bridget, whose family name is not known. He removed to Cambridge about 1682, and died there November 3, 1688. His wife Bridget died at Concord, March 5, 1680. His will shows his children to have been:

(2) BOAZ, born Feb. 14, 1641–2; married, first, Nov. 8, 1664, Mary Winship; second, October 10, 1716, Mrs. Abigail Wheat; died April 7, 1724.

(3) JABEZ, birth not recorded; died 1692; married Hannah ————, first wife; Deborah ————, second wife.

(4) MARY, born March 26, 1646; married June 21, 1669, William Woodward, at Chelmsford.

(5) ELEAZER, born July 6, 1649; married Feb. 9, 1674–5, Dinah Spaulding, at Chelmsford.

(6) THOMAS, born 1651—birth not recorded; married Ruth (Vinton) Wheeler (Jones), Nov. 12, 1677. He died April 4, 1718.

THOMAS BROWN (6), son of Thomas (1) and Bridget, his wife, was born 1651. He died April 4, 1718, at Concord, Mass., aged 67 years (p. 94). His gravestone is at Concord, Mass. He was married to Ruth Jones, Nov. 12, 1677 (p. 20), by ————. Ruth Jones was the widow of Ephraim Jones, whom he married May 7, 1773 (p. 73). She was the daughter of Capt. Thomas Wheeler and his wife Ruth. Her birth is not recorded. After the death of her husband, Thomas Brown, she married Capt. Jonathan Prescott, Aug. 18, 1718 (p. 93). She died Feb. 9, 1740 (p. 144).

They had the following children:

(7) RUTH, born Feb. 8, 1678–9; married Samuel Jones, Nov. 10, 1698; died March 22, 1764.

(8) MARY, born Nov. 18, 1681; married John Hunt; died July 14, 1750.

(9) REBECCA, born March 5, 1683–4; married Sept. 26, 1704, Jonathan Hubbard, of Watertown.

(10) EPHRAIM, born April 21, 1689; married August 28, 1719, Hannah Wilson; died Feb. 6, 1749–1750.

(11) THOMAS, born Aug. 28, 1686; married Nov. 22, 1709, Hannah Potter; died March 13, 1717–1718.

(12) ELIZABETH, born March 8, 1691–2; married Sept. 22, 1713, Jonathan Hartwell, at Watertown; died Dec. 28, 1718.

THOMAS BROWN, 2D (6), was for many years (1689–1700, and from 1704–1709) Town Clerk of Concord, and was "Selectman" from 1706–1709 (see "Shattuck's History of Concord," pp. 233–234). He was also an ensign of the local military company, as he appears with that title on the records first in 1702, but

the date of his commission is not known. He enrolled in the service against the Indians in Phillip's War, Dec. 3, 1675 (see Massachusetts Archives, vol. LXVIII., fol. 85), and was wounded at the fight at Narragansett Fort a few days later (16th, it is supposed); see also "Bodge's Soldiers of King Phillip's War," pp. 123–24). This was before he became an ensign. The family were all farmers, and very extensive landholders. Some of the land granted to the first Thomas Brown did not pass out of the hands of his descendants until within the last half-dozen years (1896). Several of his descendants of later generations were active patriots in the Revolutionary War. One of them, namely, Jonas, was severely wounded at the Concord fight.

THOMAS BROWN (11), son of Thomas (6), was born Aug. 28, 1686 (p. 35). He died March 13, 1717–1718 in his 32d year (p. 94). He was married to Hannah Potter, Nov. 22, 1709, by Rev. Mr. Joseph Estabrookes (p. 74). Hannah Potter was the daughter of John Potter and Grace (Brooks), and was born Dec. 20, 1690 (p. 34). She died Dec. 1, 1782, aged 92 years (p. 417). After the death of her first husband she married Simon Davis June 1, 1719. Thomas Brown and Hannah, his wife, had children as follows:

(13) EPHRAIM, born Nov. 7, 1710; died Oct. 9, 1788; married June 20, 1732, Abigail Wheeler.

(14) TIMOTHY, born Aug. 17, 1712; married Rebecca Farrar.

(15) LUKE, born Nov. 3, 1714.

(16) HANNAH, born Dec. 6, 1716.

EPHRAIM (13) (Deacon), son of Thomas (11) and Hannah, his wife, was born Nov. 7, 1710 (p. 75). He died Oct. 9, 1788, aged 78 years (p. 322). He was Selectman from 1730 to 1733 (see "Shattuck's History of Concord," p. 234). He was deacon from 1744 until his death ("Shattuck's History of Concord," p. 194). He was married to Abigail Wheeler June 20, 1732, by Justice Flint (p. 130). Abigail Wheeler was the daughter of Edward and Sarah, his wife, and was born Nov. 1, 1712. She died Dec. 14, 1794, aged 84 years (p. 323). Ephraim Brown and Abigail, his wife, had children as follows:

(17) ABIGAIL, born April 9, 1733; married Nov. 1, 1753, Thomas Hubbard.

(18) EPHRAIM, born April 7, 1735; died Feb. 6, 1736–7.

(19) EDWARD, born Feb. 15, 1736–7; married, first, Mary Brown, Jan. 15, 1761; second, in 1780, Buelah Hosmer.

(20) THANKFUL, born Dec. 16, 1740; married July 6, 1758, Edward Wright; died Sept. 9, 1776.

(21) EPHRAIM, born Dec. 20, 1742; married Sybil Patterson; died June 16, 1812.

(22) HANNAH, born April 1, 1745; died June 18, 1745.

(23) SARAH, born Sept. 25, 1746; married Samuel Farrar.

(24) THOMAS, born March 25, 1749; never married; died April 25, 1774.

(25) SAMUEL (Lieut.), born Sept. 18, 1752; married Elizabeth Brown; died Oct. 29, 1819.

EPHRAIM BROWN (21), born Dec. 20, 1742 (p. 157), son of Ephraim Brown (13) and Abigail, his wife; died June 16, 1812. Ephraim Brown and his wife are buried in Litchfield, Herkimer Co., N. Y. In the spring of 1898, I visited the old cemetery at Litchfield, and found a stone on which was the following:

"In memory of Ephraim Brown, who died June 16, 1812, aged 70 years." Also "Sybil, wife of Ephraim Brown, died September 11, 1810, aged 64 years."

Another stone contains the following: "In memory of George and Jeremiah, sons of Ephraim and Philomena Brown, died June 2, 1820, aged 1 mo and 19 days."

Another stone contains the following: "In memory of Ephraim Brown, Jr., who died May 14, 1748, aged 45 years."

Another stone contains the following: "In memory of Sybil Ester, daughter of Ephraim and Philomena Brown, died Sept. 14, 1828, aged 19 years."

On March 31, 1768, Ephraim Brown was married to Sybil Patterson, of Concord, Mass., by the Rev. William Emerson (p. 241). Sybil Patterson was born July 24, 1745. She died Sept. 11, 1810.. "Blood's History of Temple, N. H.," Boston, 1860, shows the following in relation to Ephraim Brown: "During the War of the Revolution he was one of a committee to fix the prices of staple articles, for example, 'a mug of flip with half a pint of West India rum, 1s. 2d.'" (p. 83). This is interesting as showing the attempts which were made during the Revolution to fix the prices of staple articles, when the tendency, owing to the depreciated currency, was for prices to constantly rise. Ephraim Brown's Revolutionary services are shown as follows: He marched from Temple to Cambridge at the time of the Lexington alarm—the beginning of the American Revolution—April 19, 1775 (p. 97). He was on the committee of public safety in the Colony of New Hampshire, and on April 12th this committee resolved: "That we the subscribers do hereby profess our entire willingness at the risk of our lives our fortunes with arms to oppose the hostile attempts of the British fleets and armies against the United American Colonies whenever and to such a degree as such attempts of Britain may require" (p. 105). In October, 1776, he was "one of nine soldiers who went on an alarm to Ticonderoga" (p. 107). In July, 1777, he was "one of seventeen men who marched to Bennington in Captain S. Parker's Company, Col. M. Nichol's Regiment, General John Stark's Brigade"

(p. 115). May 21, 1770, he was on a committee to repair the "meeting house." At this time he was a member of the Congregational Church. His civil services were as follows: 1775 and 1784 he was Selectman, and in 1786 he was Constable (pp. 188 and 189). He left Temple about 1793 for Litchfield, Herkimer Co., N. Y. On page 88 the removal of a number of families from Temple is referred to as follows: "In or about the year 1790 some nine or ten families of Baptists, most of the south part of the town, sold out their possessions and removed to a new town in New York, about 90 miles up the Mohawk, where the other inhabitants were mostly Dutch people, who numbered far more than the English. In a few years they got the town incorporated by the name of Lytchfield, and the Dutch being illiterate, the Yankees were elected to all the town offices; but after a while they complained that they paid the most taxes and ought to hold more offices, which was a fair agreement, so all turned in and elected a full Board of Dutch Selectmen, who took an invoice and met to make taxes. 'Well,' says one, 'Let's begin with the Tankees.' 'What shall Eb Drury pay?' 'Oh, he's one clever man, he shall pay one tollar.' 'Nat. Ball?' 'He sheat my bruder Hans; he shall pay two tollar.' '————————?' 'He ish one tam rascal; he shall pay four tollar.' And so on through the list; but none would pay his tax, and they had to hire the Yankees to make them over."

Referring to Ephraim Brown's services in the history of Temple see particularly pages 101 and 257 as to proof that the Ephraim Brown mentioned as a soldier was the same Ephraim Brown who lived in Temple. As to number of children, see page 257, and list of persons at time of war, page 101.

Ephraim Brown's children were as follows (see "Temple History of New Hampshire," names and dates of birth of children taken from the records of the first town book):

(26) SYBIL, born Feb. 16, 1769; died May 1, 1837.
(27) ABIGAIL, born July 18, 1770; died ————————.
(28) EPHRAIM, born Aug. 6, 1772; died Sept. 3, 1775.
(29) THOMAS, born Aug. 25, 1775; date of death ————————.
(30) ETHAN, born Sept. 25, 1776; died Oct. 20, 1777.
(31) ELIZABETH, born Jan. 13, 1779; died Sept. 10, 1811.
(32) REBECCA, born Dec. 17, 1780; died Oct. 16, 1852.
(33) EPHRAIM, born Feb. 14, 1783; died May 14, 1838.
(34) POLLY, born Jan. 10, 1785; died Jan. 17, 1853.
(35) MILLY, born Jan. 24, 1787; died ————————.
(36) THOMAS, born Aug. 20, 1788; died May 22, 1805.

(37) AMASA, and (38) AMAZIAH, born Dec. 9, 1790.

Amasa died March, 1863.

Amaziah died Dec. 12, 1799.

(39) JAMES, born Dec. 10, 1793; died March 7, 1795.

AMASA BROWN (37), son of Ephraim Brown (21) and Sybil, his wife, was born at Temple, N. H., Dec. 9, 1790. He married, first, Phoebe Stevens, sister of Jared Stevens, who married his sister Polly, March, 1813, in Litchfield, Herkimer Co., N. Y., and removed to Henderson, Jefferson Co. Amasa Brown and Phoebe, his wife, had the following children:

(40) HORACE, born Dec. 20, 1813; died in Adams, March 30, 1890.

(41) LUCY ANN, born July 9, 1815; died Jan. 28, 1818.

(42) PAMELA, born Sept. 15, 1817; died July 5, 1820.

(43) PATTERSON, born July 14, 1819; died March 12, 1820.

Amasa Brown married for his second wife Sally Goodwin Hopkins, daughter of Judge Jesse Hopkins, of Henderson, Dec. 4, 1820. She was born Sept. 14, 1797, and she died Nov. 14, 1856. Amasa Brown and Sally Goodwin Brown, his wife, had the following children:

(44) THOMAS GOODWIN, born Aug. 27, 1821; died at Mexico, Oswego Co., N. Y., Feb. 17, 1879.

(45) ELIZABETH HOPKINS, born Nov. 16, 1822; died Dec. 28, 1845.

(46) JAMES SHELDON, born April 19, 1824; died Adams, March 30, 1894.

(47) ARTHUR JESSE, born April 12, 1828; died Adams, Sept. 7, 1881.

(48) CATHERINE SARAH, born May 23, 1830; died April 4, 1895.

Amasa Brown married for his third wife Mrs. Florence Wallace, widow of Judge Wallace, late of Ft. Covington, Franklin Co., N. Y., May 4, 1859. She died in Adams, Jefferson Co., a little later than 1870.

THOMAS GOODWIN BROWN (44), son of Amasa Brown and Sally Goodwin Hopkins, was born Aug. 27, 1821; died Feb. 17, 1879. He married Josephine Cornelia Keith, of Henderson. They had the following children:

(49) ELIZABETH ROBBINS, born Dec. 13, 1845; married Thurston G. Packer.

(50) CATHERINE JOSEPHINE, born Dec. 13, 1845; died Aug. 10, 1879.

(51) GOODWIN, born April 5, 1852.

(52) JESSE HOPKINS, born Oct. 12, 1858; died Jan. 23, 1901.

(53) SARAH ANNE, born Nov. 25, 1862.

GOODWIN BROWN (51), son of Thomas Goodwin Brown and Josephine, his wife, was born April 5, 1852; married Lilian Spencer Woodhouse, daughter of Col. Levi Woodhouse, of Hartford, Conn., Oct. 4, 1877. Goodwin Brown and Lilian, his wife, have one child.

(54) FRASER, born June 10, 1879.

ELIZABETH ROBBINS BROWN (49), born Dec. 13, 1845; married Oct. 11, 1864, Thurston G. Packer. They had the following children:

(55) FLAVIUS A., born Aug. 21, 1865; died Feb. 25, 1866.

(56) FLAVIUS, born Feb. 3, 1867.

(57) GOODWIN T., born Nov. 1, 1869.

(58) JOSEPHINE C., born April 8, 1874; married W. A. L. Thomas Aug. 1, 1900.

(59) JESSE H., born Jan. 13, 1882.

See genealogical notes of Hopkins and Goodwin and Brown families, descendants 40 and 45, and also for more detailed information relative to the children of Thomas Goodwin Brown (44), on file in New York State Library and principal libraries in New York, Massachusetts and Connecticut, prepared by me about 1895.

See also the wills of Edmund Brown, Thomas Brown (6) and Thomas Brown (11) in the Probate Court records in Cambridge, Mass.

GOODWIN BROWN.

YONKERS, N. Y., March 22, 1901.

GENEALOGICAL NOTES

HOPKINS-GOODWIN-BROWN

PREPARED BY

GOODWIN BROWN, Esq.

1895

Notes taken from History of Waterbury, in New York State Library (No. 974. 67 W. 29), Henry Bronson (Author) Waterbury, May, 1858: "The Goodwins of Hartford, Conn., J. L. Goodwin," and other works. There is a new History of Waterbury now in course of preparation (December, 1895), which will doubtless throw additional light on the Hopkins family.

The following notes relate principally to the Hopkins and Goodwin branches of the family.

HOPKINS

1. John Hopkins, settled at Cambridge, Mass, 1630.
2. Stephen Hopkins, son of John, born 1634.
3. John Hopkins, son of Stephen, born 1665.
4. Stephen Hopkins, son of John, born 1689.
5. Joseph Hopkins, son of Stephen, born 1730.
6. Jesse Hopkins, son of Joseph, born May 20, 1766.
7. Sally Goodwin Hopkins, daughter of Jesse Hopkins, born Sept. 13, 1798.
8. Thomas Goodwin Brown, son of Sally Goodwin Hopkins and Amasa Brown, born 1822.
9. Goodwin Brown, son of Thomas Goodwin Brown, born April 5, 1852.
10. Fraser Brown, son of Goodwin Brown, born June 10, 1879.

1. John Hopkins came from Coventry, England, certainly as early as 1630, and settled at Cambridge, Mass. Married Jane ——. (See American Ancestry, vol. 4, page 228.) Made a freeman March 4, 1634. (See Records of Mass., vol. 1, page 370); removed to Hartford, Conn., 1636; was there an original proprietor the year before, where he became a selectman in 1640, and a juror in 1643. In Paige's History of Cambridge, from 1630 to 1877, pages XV-XVI, the plan of Cambridge is given, and the homestead of John Hopkins is shown, and is indicated as No. 24, situated on Spring or Mount Auburn St. The biographical sketch on p. 580 corresponds with the sketch given in the History of Waterbury. It is not known what relation, if any, he bore to Stephen Hopkins, who came to Plymouth, Mass., in 1620 in the Mayflower (Mrs. Milton Haxtun, of 56 St. Felix St., Brooklyn, a distinguished genealogist, asserts her belief that he was a son of Stephen Hopkins), or to Edward Hopkins, who arrived in Boston in 1637, and afterwards was Governor of Connecticut. John Hopkins' will was dated 1648, and the inventory April 14, 1654. He left a widow, Jane, who afterwards married Nathaniel Ward, and two children, Stephen and Bethia. The last named married Samuel Stocking, of Middletown, Conn. John Hopkins' name appears among the proprietors of the undivided lands in Hartford, as the owner of lots 26 and 24 (See p. 9 of the Historical Notices of Hartford, Conn., No. 1-1640). In the last above work, the location of the residence of John Hopkins is given as house lot 43 in the 8th tier which "lies on the west side of Trumbull Street, and is numbered 35 to 43 from Burr Street to the River." It is stated in this work that "the most distinguished families among the first settlers were located on the two sides of the Little River." In the Memorial History of Hartford County, Conn., p. 228, a map of the City of Hartford as it existed in 1640 is shown. On this map the residence of John Hopkins is located on the south bank of the Little River, opposite the two islands, on the high-way.

The following sketch of the original proprietors is given on p. 247 of the last above work:

"John Hopkins, Cambridge, 1630; freeman, Mass., March 4, 1634; removed to Hartford, where he was an original proprietor; his home lot was on what is now the East Park; chosen townsman, 1640; juror, 1643; d. in 1654; inv. April 14, 1654, 236.8 pounds; left a widow, Jane, who married (2) Nathaniel Ward, of Hartford, afterward of Hadley (q. v.)- Ch. 1. Stephen, b. ab. 1634; made a freeman, 1657; m. Dorcas, dau. of John Bronson, of Farmington; chosen townsman, 1668, 1672; d. Oct. 1689. The great thelogian, Rev. Samuel Hopkins of Great Barrington and Newport, was his great-grandson. II. Bethia, b. ab. 1635; m. (1) May 27, 1652, Deacon Samuel Stocking of Middletown; (2) Jas. Steele, of Hartford." See also History of Waterbury, pp. 151, 152, 502, 503.

2. Stephen Hopkins, son of John, born 1634; married Dorcas, daughter of John Bronson, 1st., of Farmington; he died about 1689; made a freeman 1656. His will bore date Sept. 28, 1680, and his inventory amounted to 591 pounds. In the Historical Notices of Hartford, Con., No. 1, p. 42, 1640, it

appears that in the laying out of lands according to the just proportions to each of the "original proprietors," Stephen Hopkins, son of John, was given lot 6, being 12 rods in breadth and containing 36 acres. See reference to Stephen Hopkins under John Hopkins, the original settler. See also History of Waterbury, pp. 151, 152, 502, 503.

3. John Hopkins, son of Stephen, of Waterbury, born 1665. He married Hannah ——. "He was one of the most respected and influential of the early settlers of Waterbury." He subscribed to the sixty pound settlement of the first minister; was townsman in 1692, and several times afterwards; constable in 1702; grand juror for two years; deputy in 1704, and many times from 1708 to 1726; justice of the peace 1725 to 1729, inclusive. He held the office of town clerk in 1713, and was also tavern keeper from 1712 to 1718, inclusive, and probably earlier, and ordinary keeper in 1714-1715. He obtained, too, military honor, so much sought for in his day, being sergeant in 1714, ensign in 1715, and lieutenant in 1716. After the later date he was known as "Left. Hopkins." When the new meeting house came to be settled in 1729, he was one of the revered dignitaries who were voted into "the first pew at the west end of the pulpit." (Hist. of Waterbury, p. 152).

"John Hopkins' house and lot was situated on the corner of East Main and Bank Streets. It contains two acres, and was bounded December 26, 1691. The house stood on Main street a little east of the lane put down on the map as Brook Street."

John Hopkins was a large land holder. He gave away much land during his lifetime to his children by deed; still he left a considerable estate. He died November 16, 1732. His inventory amounted to 1251 pounds. (History of Waterbury, pp. 152-3).

It appears that John Hopkins was engaged in the Indian wars.

July 20, 1710, he was appointed with two others a committee to "draw up in writing the circumstances of the town in this time of war and represent to the general court to be holden in New Haven on August 4, 1710, by their deputies to be by them presented to said court." (History of Waterbury, pp. 106-107).

He was again appointed on the committe of public safety April 9, 1711, and to represent to the general court the fears of the colony of the common enemy and to take their advice and counsel. (History of Waterbury, pp. 107-8).

In 1716 he was appointed lieutenant—having been formerly an ensign of the military company at Waterbury. (History of Waterbury, p. 152).

This was evidently regarded as a high honor, as "military titles were in high repute among the colonists. They were preferred to civil or ecclesiastical honors. A corporal was on the road to distinction. His office was occasionally, but not usually, attached to his name. A sergeant had attained distinction, and his title was never omitted. An ensign or a lieutenant was lifted quite above the heads of his fellows." (History of Waterbury, pp. 109-110).

On page 16 is a map of Waterbury, on which is shown the house of John Hopkins, and he is put down as one of the original proprietors.

Among the personal notices of the first settlers of Waterbury it is stated "not one of them bore a name which was particularly distinguished in the early history of the colonies with the exception of Hopkins." (History of Waterbury, p. 129).

The author states that since the above was written, he has looked in the Brooks' Encyclopedia of Heraldry, London, 1844, and he finds there among the following names those of Andrews, Barnes, Bronson, Carrington, Clark, Hancock and Hopkins. (History of Waterbury, pp. 129-130), pp. 151, 152, 502, 503.

4. Stephen Hopkins, son of John, of Waterbury, born Nov. 19, 1689, died 1769. Married Susanna, daughter of John Peck, of Wallingford, 1717.

He received "bachelor accommodations" in 1712; was townsman in 1724, and afterwards; deputy many times after 1732; special agent to the general court in 1737-8. He was a prominent man in his day. His house was near the west corner of East Main and MillStreets. (History of Waterbury, pp. 153, 502, 503).

5. Joseph Hopkins, son of Stephen, of Waterbury. Born in the limits of present Naugatick, June 6, 1730. He married Hepzibah, daughter of Thomas Clark, Nov. 28, 1754. Joseph Hopkins died in New Haven, Conn., March 27, 1801. His father was a man of influence, and frequently representative to the general court, "and the celebrated Samuel Hopkins of Newport was his first cousin."

He was appointed "town treasurer in 1758, and held the office six successive years; in 1762 was made justice of the peace, and was continued in office until 1766. In the spring of 1764 he was chosen a representative to the General Assembly, and from that period until 1796 was reëlected forty-four times, or for nearly two-thirds of the sessions. He was an active and earnest patriot during the war of the revolution, and for most of the time was a respected member of the lower house. In consequence probably of his knowledge of metals he was put at the head of a committee in 1775 to visit the lead mines of the state. In 1776 he was selected for a similar service, the committee being charged to search for lead (great at that time was the dearth of lead). He was one of those appointed in 1777 to sign the small bills for currency." (History of Waterbury, p. 411).

In 1777 he was appointed one of the justices of the quorum, which post he held until he died. When the probate district of Waterbury was established in 1779 he was made its first judge, and was continued in office during his life. For more than thirty years before his death he was more widely and advantageously known than any other man of the town. The following notice of his death is given: "Died in the City of New Haven, Conn., Joseph Hopkins, Esq., senior assistant judge of the county court for the court of New Haven, in the seventy-second year of his age. On Saturday the corpse was conveyed to Waterbury attended by some of his family, accompanied

a part of the way by a procession composed of the judges of the court and the college and the gentlemen of the bar, the sheriff and other officers of the court and citizens of New Haven. The procession stopped in front of the court-house, and a prayer well adapted to the occasion was made by the Reverend President Dwight (of Yale College) in the presence of a large collection of the inhabitants." (History of Waterbury, pp. 411-412).

In 1774 he was appointed one of a committee to sustain and carry out the work of the Continental Congress. This committee adopted a resolution as follows:

"This committee therefore agree and resolve faithfully to adhere to and strictly to abide by the decision entered into by said Congress—and appoint the gentlemen hereinafter named a committee to see the same carried into execution in every title thereof." (See History of Waterbury, pp. 334-5.)

At the next meeting held Jan. 12th, 1775, he was one of the committee chosen to "receive the donations that may be contributed towards the relief of the poor in Boston," who were suffering at this time from the effects of the odious Boston Port Bill. See History of Waterbury, p. 336.)

"After the Declaration of Independence and its approval by the State of Connecticut, in October, 1776, a law against high treason was enacted and defined. At the same time an oath of fidelity was prescribed and enjoined to be taken by the freemen and officers of the same. No person could execute any office after January 1, 1777, till he had taken the oath of fidelity; no freeman could vote for any officer till he had taken the same. This law was repealed in December, but another was enacted in June, 1777. At the session in August the members of assembly took the prescribed oath. Mr. Joseph Hopkins and Capt. Ezra Bronson were the representatives from Waterbury." (History of Waterbury, p. 345).

In Feb., 1781, still more stringent laws, aimed at what is called "freedom of speech and the press," were passed. One enacted that if any person, being a citizen, "should by writing profess or declare that the king of Great Britain hath or of right ought to have, any authority or dominion in or over this state, or the inhabitants thereof, or that he or they owe allegiance to the said king within the same," etc, he shall be "put to death."

Mr. Abner Johnson and Mr. Joseph Hopkins were the members for Waterbury at the above session. (See History of Waterbury, pp. 353-572).

"General Lafayette once during the war—perhaps more than once—passed through Waterbury. He also on one occasion stopped at the house of Joseph Hopkins, Esq., then the most prominent civilian in the place." (History of Waterbury, pp. 358-359).

"General Washington passed through Waterbury certainly once on his way to Hartford, in 1780 or 1781. He dined with Judge Joseph Hopkins, whose house stood on the site of S. M. Buckingham's dwelling," (History of Waterbury, p. 358).

Among those who had the largest taxable estate he stood next to the highest, being taxed for 156 pounds, and he is mentioned as one of the seven

who owned watches—which evidently was regarded as an important matter.

He was a member of the convention of Connecticut which met in January, 1788, and ratified the constitution of the United States and voted for its ratification. (History of Waterbury, pp. 502, 503, 575.)

6. Jesse Hopkins, son of Joseph, born May 20, 1766. Hough, in his History of Jefferson County, says of him: "At the age of seventeen on the visit of Generals Washington and Lafayette at the residence of his father, Lafayette was so pleased with the youth that he made him his aide during a series of military operations at that quarter. His youth prevented him from enlisting in the army and his love of country from accepting the invitation of Lafayette to visit France." This statement of Hough is doubted by the author of the History of Waterbury, who says that while young Hopkins was not too young to have been engaged in the war of the revolution, actual hostilities had ceased.

Judge Jesse Hopkins of himself says: "I was in childhood at the commencement of the revolutionary war, and at its close had just arrived at that age which entitled me to shoulder my musket and be alive to all the interesting events of the day. Being a son of a revolutionary patriot, who was a member of the State Legislature, I had an opportunity of acquiring considerable political information for many years, as well as inhaling that spirit of patriotism which was characteristic of the times." (History of Waterbury, pp. 412-413, 504.)

In December, 1794, he married Elizabeth, the daughter of Nathaniel Goodwin, of Hartford, by whom he had two children, Betsey and Sally Goodwin the latter my grandmother.

His wife died in 1799. He subsequently married his cousin, the granddaughter of Samuel Hopkins, D. D., the celebrated divine of Newport, R. I.

In 1805 Jesse Hopkins was appointed the agent of William Henderson, of New York, the owner of a large tract of land in the western part of Jefferson Co., N. Y. He removed thither and opened a land office. When the town of Henderson was organized in 1806; he was elected supervisor, and held the office until 1810. In 1813 he became county judge, having been appointed by DeWitt Clinton. "He erected a fine seat at the head of the bay, commanding a prospect of unrivalled beauty." (This house is still standing at the head of Henderson Bay, although the original structure has been greatly changed). My father, Thomas Goodwin Brown, resided there from 1856 to 1862.

It is stated by Dr. Hough that he wrote a Patriot's Manual—of which my mother has a copy.—G. Brown.

A steel plate engraving of Judge Hopkins appears on p. 433 of Hough's History of Jefferson County, executed by J. B. Gavit, of Albany.

7. Sally Goodwin Hopkins Brown, daughter of Jesse (she was Amasa Brown's second wife), born 1798, in Hartford, Conn.; married Amasa Brown of Henderson, Jefferson Co., N. Y. She died in 1856 in that town. They had the following children: Thomas Goodwin Brown, James S. Brown, Arthur J. Brown, Catherine Dwight (Brown), Elizabeth Robbins (Brown).

8. Thomas Goodwin Brown, son of Sally Goodwin Hopkins Brown, born in Henderson, Jefferson Co., N. Y., 1822, son of the preceding. He married Josephine C. Keith of Henderson, Jefferson Co., N. Y. They had the following children: Elizabeth Robbins Packer (maiden name Brown), Catherine Josephine Brown (died in 1879), Goodwin Brown, Sarah A. Brown and Jesse Hopkins Brown.

9. Goodwin Brown, son of Thomas Goodwin Brown and Josephine C. Keith, born in Henderson, Jefferson Co., N. Y., 1852; married Lillian Spencer Woodhouse, of Hartford, Conn., daughter of Col. Levi Woodhouse and Theodosia Antoinette Woodhouse. Col. Woodhouse died in Albany at No. 21 North Pine Ave., the residence of Goodwin Brown, Oct. 17, 1895, and was buried in Hartford, Conn., Oct. 21 of that year. Goodwin Brown has one son, an only child, Fraser Brown, born June 10, 1879, Hartford, Conn.

Goodwin Brown was educated at the academy in the village of Mexico, and continued his education at Cornell university in the class of 1875. In college he was class essayist for two successive years; a member of the Psi Upsilon and Phi Kappa Psi Greek letter societies. In 1894 he was elected vice-president of the Albany Cornell alumni association.

In 1891 Union college conferred the honorary degree of A. M. on Mr. Brown.

After leaving Cornell Mr. Brown was engaged in business for a few years in Hartford and Cincinnati. In the fall of 1878 he removed to Buffalo, and in the following spring was admitted to practice in the Supreme Court of the state, and during the next year was admitted to practice in the United States Courts. January 1, 1883, he was appointed by Governor Cleveland as pardon and extradition clerk in the Governor's office—he being the second appointment made by Mr. Cleveland as Governor. Governor Hill reappointed him to the position at the beginning of his term in 1886 and again in 1889. In 1889, upon the creation of the State Commission in Lunacy, Governor Hill appointed Mr. Brown the legal member of the Commission. He was reappointed by Governor Flower in 1893 for a term of six years.

In 1887 Governor Hill appointed Mr. Brown a delegate to represent the state of New York at a convention of states and territories called for the unification and improvement of the extradition laws. He was secretary of the convention, and one of a committtee to prepare a bill for presentation to Congress, providing for the regulation of the extradition of fugitives from justice.

In 1889 Mr. Brown was appointed by the trustees of Cornell university special lecturer in the school of law, and was reappointed in 1891 and also in 1894. He is a member of the board for the establishment of state insane asylum districts.

Mr. Brown is the author of the statute providing for the reduction of sentences of convicts for good behavior, and providing in the event of the violation of the condition of discharge that they may be reimprisoned for the unexpired portion of their term; for the remission of fines in criminal

cases; revising the extradition statutes of New York, and providing that no person charged with crime shall be returned to another state unless regularly extradited; providing for the subpoenaing of witnesses and for the production of books and cases in pardon cases before the governor; providing that convicts must be sentenced so that their terms shall expire during warm weather, when the opportunities for employment are the best; requiring that all stenographer's minutes and all legal papers in all legal actions shall be transcribed and printed on paper of standard size, in order to provide for the effectual preservation of court papers and documents; providing that no person charged with a crime punishable by life imprisonment shall be convicted upon a plea of "guilty;" providing for the appointment of women physicians in state hospitals; providing for the erection of free public baths in cities and towns of New York in 1892, and for the amendment of the act passed in 1895, which makes the erection of such baths mandatory; providing for a general scheme for fire protection in all public institutions supported wholly or in part by the state; for the erection of outside iron stairways in all general hospitals in the state; providing for the appointment of a committee of a lunatic without the expense and delay of a jury where the state is the petitioner.

The Medical Record in New York city, Dr. George F. Shrady, editor, under date of June 22, 1895, stated that one of the two great acts of which the legislature of 1895 should be entitled to credit was the act providing for the erection and maintenance of free public baths.

The State Commission in Lunacy, of which Mr. Brown was a member, recommended to the legislature, in 1889, that all of the insane in the poorhouses of the state be removed to the state hospitals, and that the insane become a state charge. The recommendation of the Commission was adopted by the legislature of 1890, and an appropriation of half a million of dollars was made for the erection of additional buildings. In 1893 the last of the insane in the poorhouses were removed to the state hospitals, and the state made a direct appropriation for the support, and placed the financial control of all the state hospitals in the hands of the Commission. In 1894 the State Commission in Lunacy was made a constitutional body by vote of 122 in favor to 18 against—the constitution was ratified by the people that year, and went into effect January 1, 1895.

10. Elizabeth Robbins Packer, daughter of Thomas Goodwin Brown, born in Henderson, Jefferson Co., N. Y., December 13, 1845; married Thurston Green Packer, born in Ellisburgh, Jefferson County, N. Y., May 19, 1842. They have had the following children: Flavius Augustus Packer, 1st, born August 21, 1865; died February 25, 1866; Flavius Brown Packer, born February 3, 1867; Goodwin Packer, born November 1, 1869; Josephine Cornelia Packer, born May 8, 1873. All of these children were born in Mexico, Oswego Co., N. Y. Jesse Hopkins Packer, born Jan. 13, 1883, in Smyrna, Chenango Co., N. Y.

11. Jesse Hopkins Brown, son of Thomas Goodwin Brown, born October 12, 1858, in Henderson, Jefferson Co., N. Y.; married Frances Pruyn in 1879. They had the following children: George, born in Mexico, Oswego Co., N. Y., in 1879, and died in infancy; Garrett, born in Syracuse, N. Y., in 1881; Harold, born in Syracuse, in 1887. (I have given the dates of birth of my brother's children as accurately as I recall the same.)

12. Sarah Ann Brown, born 1863.

GOODWIN

1. Ozias Goodwin, the head of the Connecticut family of that name.
2. Nathaniel Goodwin, son of Ozias, born about 1637.
3. Nathaniel Goodwin, son of Nathaniel, born July, 1665.
4. Daniel Goodwin, Son of Nathaniel, born Jan. 15, 1705.
5. Nathaniel Goodwin, son of Daniel, baptised Nov. 13, 1743.
6. Elizabeth Goodwin, daughter of Nathaniel, born July 27, 1773.
7. Sally Goodwin, daughter of Elizabeth, born Sept. 13, 1798.
8. Thomas Goodwin Brown, son of Sally Goodwin, born 1822.
9. Goodwin Brown, son of Thomas Goodwin Brown, born April 5, 1852.
10. Fraser Brown, son of Goodwin, born June 10, 1879.

1. Ozias Goodwin, the head of the Connecticut family of that name, married Mary Woodward, daughter of Robert, of Braintree, Eng., in 1639. He had become a resident of Hartford, Conn. A copy of an affidavit is given on p. 107 of the Goodwins of Hartford, Conn., showing that he was a partner of William Goodwin, one of the original settlers of Cambridge, Mass., and who removed to Hartford. (The Goodwins of Hartford (1891) p. 107).

2. Nathaniel Goodwin, son of Ozias, born about 1637; was admitted a freeman by the general court of Connecticut in October, 1662, and was one of the "townsmen" of Hartford in 1669, 1678, 1682. He married Sarah Coles, daughter of John and Hannah Coles, of Hatfield, Mass., formerly of Farmington, Conn. Sarah (Coles) Goodwin died May 8, 1676, aged 29, and her monument still to be seen in the Center Church burying ground (on Main street in the City of Hartford, a short distance from the old city hall)—is the oldest one now extant in Hartford bearing the name of Goodwin.

The inscription on the tombstone (as I saw it Oct. 20, 1895), as copied by Charles J. Hoadley, state librarian of Connecticut, is as follows: "SARAH, the wife of NATHANIEL GOODWIN, OF HARTFORD, AGED 29 YEARS, DESASED, MAY 8th, 1676."

Nathaniel Godwin married (2) Elizabeth Pratt, daughter of Daniel Pratt, of Hartford. The will of Nathaniel Goodwin, dated April 19, 1690, is given in "The Goodwins of Hartford (1891) p. 549.

3. Nathaniel Goodwin, son of Nathaniel, born July, 1665; married (1) Lois Porter, daughter of Deacon Thomas Porter, of Farmington. She died June 15, 1697, aged 27. Nathaniel married (2), Sept. 14, 1699, Sarah Easton, born Nov. 15, 1675, daughter of John Easton. In May, 1721, he was appointed

ensign of the North Company or train band of Hartford. He died March 12, 1746. His wife Sarah (Easton) Goodwin died January 2, 1740. (The Goodwins of Hartford, p. 554).

4. Daniel Goodwin, son of Nathaniel, born Jan. 15, 1705. He married (1) Dorothy Cole, daughter of John and Elizabeth (Goodwin) Cole, who died Oct. 7, 1746, aged 26. He married (2) Nov. 6, 1748, Abagail (Olcott) Bigelow, February 15, 1703-4, daughter of John and Mary Blackleach (Wells) Olcott, and widow of Timothy Bigelow. Daniel Goodwin was appointed ensign of the Hartford train band inOctober, 1737; lieutenant May, 1744; and captain, October, 1749, which latter position he held until April, 1755, and was six years one of the selectmen of the town, and deacon of the first church from 1769 until his death, Jan. 6, 1772. He left an estate of over 10,000 pounds. His widow, Abigail (Olcott) Bigelow-Goodwin, died Dec. 26, 1776. (The Goodwins of Hartford, p. 556.)

5. Nathaniel Goodwin, son of Daniel (date of birth not given), baptised Nov. 13, 1743; married Anna Sheldon, daughter of Isaac Sheldon. Nathaniel Goodwin was a merchant in Hartford, and died Feb. 20, 1782. Anna (Sheldon) Goodwin, died Feb. 4, 1823, aged 73. (The Goodwins of Hartford, p. 557).

6. Elizabeth Goodwin, daughter of Nathaniel, born July 27, 1773; married Dec. 3, 1794, Jesse Hopkins, born May 20, 1766, son of Judge Joseph and Hepzibah (Clark) Hopkins of Waterbury, Conn. (The Goodwins of Hartford, p. 557).

7. Sally Goodwin Hopkins, daughter of Elizabeth Goodwin and Jesse Hopkins, born in Hartford, Sept. 13, 1798.

8. Thomas Goodwin Brown, son of Sally Goodwin (Hopkins) Brown, born in Henderson, Jefferson Co., N. Y., 1822.

9. Goodwin Brown, son of Thomas Goodwin Brown and Josephine C. Keith, born in Henderson, Jefferson Co., N. Y., 1852.

10. Fraser Brown, son of Goodwin Brown, born in Hartford, Conn., June 10, 1879.

Prepared Dec. 28, 1895.

GOODWIN BROWN.

(5 N 96 - 3)

In the Matter of the Hopkins Family

I, Goodwin Brown, on Saturday, October 30th, personally copied from the Connecticut Courant the following in relation to the death of Judge Joseph Hopkins:

From the Connecticut Courant, Monday, March 30, 1801.

"Died at New Haven, last Friday, Joseph Hopkins, Esq., of Waterbury, aged 71 years. He was for many years a representative of the town, and one of the Judges of the County Court for New Haven County."

From the Connecticut Courant, Monday, April 6, 1801.

"New Haven, April 2. Died in this city , on Friday the 27th ult. of the angina pectoris, Joseph Hopkins, Esq., Senior Assistant Judge of the County Court for the County of New Haven, in the 72nd year of his age. He had attended the Court during the Session until the Tuesday before his death, when complaining of ill-health he left the Bench. On Saturday the corpse was conveyed to Waterbury attended by some of his family and other connexions, accompanied part of the way by a respectful procession composed of the Judges of the Court, the Clergy, the gentlemen of the Bar, the Sheriff and other officers of the Court and citizens of New Haven. The procession stopped in front of the Court House, and a prayer well adapted to the occasion was made by the Rev. Robert President Dwight, in the presence of a large collection of the inhabitants, sympathizing in the loss of a man endeared to them by a long course of faithful services. Possessing a sound mind and an honest heart, he faithfully discharged to general acceptance the

duties of a Deacon in the Church of the First Society in Waterbury, Justice of the Peace, a Representative in the Legislature, a Judge of Probates for the District of Waterbury, and of Assistant Judge in the County Court for about thirty years. From early life adorning his course in an exemplary manner with the possession and practice of Christianity."

(Mch. 12, '96,)

The People of the State of New York, By the Grace of God Free and Independent: To Jesse Hopkins, of our County of Jefferson, Esquire, Greeting:

Whereas by our Letters and Commission of the Pleas for our said County, bearing date the 25 day of March, 1813, we did appoint and assign Ethel Bronson and others judges of our Court of Common Pleas in and for our said County, as by the said in part recited Letters Patent and Commission, or the record thereof, in our Secretary's office made more fully and at large appear. NOW, KNOW you That We have appointed and assigned , and by these Presents Do appoint assign you the said Jesse Hopkins also a Judge of our Court of Common Pleas for our said County of Jefferson. Hereby associating you for that purpose with our judges appointed in and by our said in part recited Letters Patent and Commission, and hereby fully and effectually giving and granting to you, all any every the like powers and authorities granted in and by our said in part recited Letters Patent and Commission to our judges therein named, as fully and amply, to all intents and purposes, as if the same were written and hereby particularly expressed. Hereby commanding all our Judges in our said Letters Patent and Commission named, to admit and receive you our said Judge assigned by these presents, as their Associate, AND FURTHER, commanding our Sheriff of our said County , and all Constables, and other our Peace Officers, in our said County , and all others, to pay due obedience to you our said judge by these Presents assigned. In Testimony whereof, We have caused these our Letters to be made Patent, and the Great Seal of our said

State to be hereunto affixed:

WITNESS our trusty and well-beloved Daniel D. Tompkins, Esquire, Governor of our said State, General and Commander-in-Chief of all the Militia, Admiral of the Navy of the same, by and with the advice and consent of our Council of Appointment, at our City of Albany, the 16 day of March, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Eight Hundred and 14, and in the Thirty-eighth Year of our Independence.

(Signed) Daniel D. Tompkins.

(G. B. June 19- 5 cop)

In the matter

of

the ancestry of Goodwin Brown.

The annexed document contains an original autograph of Thomas ~~Hopkins~~ Clark, one of whose descendants married into the Hopkins family. Thomas Clark was a resident of Waterbury, and one of his daughters---a daughter or a grand-daughter ----I do not now recall which---Hepzibah Clark married Joseph Hopkins.

Th following letter is explanatory of the document.

Waterbury, Connecticut.

Dec. 30th, 1896.

My dear Mr. Brown:

Let me account for my failure to thank you for your kind courtesies to me. I am just recovering from an almost fatal attack of pneumonia. Early in November I went to New York for a few days shopping. After four days I was taken ill at the Everett House. My sisters and a good nurse and three doctors did what they could for me, and as soon as I was able, I came home, but the recovery is slow and uncertain. I have not been out yet and this, my fifth letter only, is alll that I have been equal to.

I thank you for the "Reports" for I am especially interested

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Office of

Secretary of State.

Particular Court

Vol. 11.

Probate Records.

I John Hopkins off Hartford being through the veseting hand off god upon my sick bed and not knowing how soon the lord may put an end to this my fraile life Being now in perfect memory for the preventing of all differencies and the setting of things in a peasable frame after my deasease doe make this my last will and testeament & doe dispose of my estate as in manner following

Imprimis I make and ordaine my loving wife Jane Hopkins my soul execumeris of my whole estate movable and immovable out of which my will is that my Saide wife shall pay all the debts which I truly owe to any person at the time of my deasease also my will is that my said wife sall pay unto my Daughter Bethiah Hopkins the summ of thirty pounds when she shall ataine the adg off eighteen years if she shall live thereunto, and my will ~~alke~~ also is that the ~~ownd~~ onne halfe of all my lands and housings should bee my Sonnes Stephen Hopkins to bee injoyed by him and his heirs for ever when hee hath attained the adg of twenty and two years my meaning is that my said Sonne Shall not require my Said wife to make good all such valuables as may befall my Said houses by fire or otherwise before he hath attained the adg of

twenty and too years But that my Said Sonn shall injoy the one halfe of all my lands and housings as they shall bee when he attainesthe ~~xgx~~ adg of aforesaid and my will is further, that if my said wife Should mary againe~~x~~ then the onne halfe of the estate that shee shall then possess~~x~~ the former portions being paid or discounted, shall be paid in & equall proportion to my Said Sonn and daughter or there heizers after the deaseas of my aforesaid wife my will ~~alke~~ allso is that my said Sonn and daughter shall remaine with and under the government of my Said wife until they ~~xxxxx~~ have attained their severall adges aforesaid, if then living and of my loving ffriends mr. John Cullick and James Ensing whome I desire to be overseere of this m~~y~~ last will and testament & my will allso is that if any of my Said children shall depart this life before they have issue or have attained their aforesaid adges that too thirds of their portione now by me bequeathed shall fall to and be enjoyed by that Child which Survives and the other third part shall fall too and be enjoyed by my said wife if then living, my will allso is that in case ~~ani~~ any deference should hapen between my Said wife and children or any of them or between my Sonn and daughter about the understanding of my true meaning in any part of this my will the issuing thereof shall be my foresaid overseers being best acquainted therewith.

Witness my hand to this my last will and testament this first day of January, 1648.

John Hopkins.

This was declared to be the

last will and testament of John
Hopkins aforesaid in the
presence of

John Cullick.
Will Andrews
James Ensing.

This may certify that we underwritten have received full satisfaction of or Beloved Brother Steven Hopkins tooe good content for whatsoever is due unto us by the last will and Testament of our Honored father John Hopkins and we doe for us our heirs executorand administrator remit release & quit our clayme to whatsoever is by the Sayd will given and bequeathed too us tooe Beloved Brother Steven Hopkins aforesaid; the same from the day of the date hereof to be to him his heirs and assigns forever as witnesseth or hand 1679.

Samuel Stocken.

Test. John Allyn, Secy.

November 11, 1679, Signed p
Bethia Stocken.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, ss.

Office of the Secretary.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of record in this office,

In Testimony Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Seal of said State, at Hartford this 4th day of September A. D. 1897.

(L. S.)

Charles Phelps, Secretary.

Form 161 12-1-'97-20M (Eleventh Edition)

STATE OF NEW YORK—STATE COMMISSION IN LUNACY

(G.B.- 5 cop., July 1, 1897)

In the matter of the ancestry of Goodwin Brown.

1 Job Keith - the ancestor - the father of Henry Keith, a native of Mendon, Worcester co., Mass., died at Cape Breton, when taken from the French by the Conolial troops in the year 1745 - he left a widow (Hannah Loutt before marriage) and four children, viz. Henry, Job, Eunice and Abi. Eunice married a John Watkins and Abi a Capt.Benjamin Pike.

2 Henry Keith, father of Phineas Keith, was born at Mendon, Mass., 1738, and died at Jackson, Washington co., N.Y., April 8, 1825. His first wife, Hannah Wheelock, the mother of Phineas Keith, was born at Uxbridge, Mass., December 1741; died October 12, 1761.

3 Phineas Keith was born at Uxbridge, Mass., March 26, 1761. He died at Henderson, Jefferson county, March 10, 1833, aged 71 years 11 months and 10 days. He married Lavina Salisbury, who was born at Gloucester, R.I., December 11, 1759. She departed this life at Henderson, October 1, 1828, aged 68 years 9 months and 20 days - a housekeeper 47 years and 6 months. Phineas Keith removed from Gloucester for Pittstown, February 5, 1789; removed from Pittstown for Floyd March 1, 1796; removed from Floyd for Western November 1, 1798; removed from Western for Sandy Creek, town of Adams, May 29, 1803; removed from Adams to Henderson, March 2, 1807.

4 Robert Keith was born at Gloucester, April 22, 1781.

5 Abigail Keith was born at Gloucester, March 29,1783.

Form 161 12-1-'97-20M (Eleventh Edition)

STATE OF NEW YORK—STATE COMMISSION IN LUNACY

6 Fleury Keith was born at Gloucester, June 4, 1785.

7 Lavina Keith was born at Gloucester, December 15,1787.

8 Polly Keith was born at Pittstown, N.Y.,August 23,1790.

9 Phineas Wheelock Keith was born at Pittstown, July 18, 1792.

10 Stephen Salisbury Keith was born at Pittstown, August 4, 1794, and died at Henderson, December 22, 1845, aged 51 years 4 months and 18 days.

11 Hannah Wheelock Keith was born at Floyd, March 29,1796

12 Harriet Keith was born at Western, April 6, 1797, and died at Henderson, March 29, 1879.

13 Cornelia Keith was born at Western, April 2, 1802.

(G. B. - May 5'97 - 6 cop)

In the matter

of

the ancestry of Lillian Spencer

Woodhouse Brown, daughter of Col.

Levi Woodhouse, of Hartford.

- x

The following letters and statements are self-explanatory

Wethersfield, Jan. 21'97

Mr. Brown:

Dear sir:

As soon as I was able, after receiving your letter, I called upon Mrs. R. Woodhouse Bobbins (or Robbins), a lady nearly 96 years old, a relative of the family, who, I thought could give me some facts which might assist you in your research.

She confirmed my statement that the two branches which located in W -- are descended from Samuel and Daniel. Abijah, the son of Daniel, was the father of Mr. Nathaniel Woodhouse, from that point the genealogy can easily be traced. There are some discrepancies in the letter and statement which I send giving name and date of the births of the family of Joseph Woodhouse, but I think the names of the sisters given in my letter are the correct ones. This paper, with others of interest to him were obtained from the town records by Mr. Robbins a son of the old lady, and he gave me this copy which I enclose. Probably other members of the family

I think Catherine and Elizabeth might have been his daughters. Aunt Phebe that I spoke of was a sister of Abijah.

Joseph Woodhouse came from England with two sisters, Catherine and Elizabeth, children of Joseph and Dorothy Woodhouse,

William Woodhouse	Born	March 18th 1717
Anna Woodhouse	Born	January 9th 1719
Hannah Woodhouse	Born	June 5th 1721
John Woodhouse	Born	October 2d 1723
Sarah Woodhouse	Born	June 9th 1726
Samuel Woodhouse	Born	October 1, 1728
Phebe Woodhouse	Born	November 29,1730
Daniel Woodhouse,	Born	October 1, 1733
Elizabeth Woodhouse	Born	September 10,1736. (Died Nov.29th1736.

Wethersfield, Jan14th,1897.

Joseph Woodhouse came to this country in 1710 with his two sisters Hannah and Judeth. They both married two Gilberts who came over with them. They were from Hertford Shire England. He was 25 years old and learned his trade at Stafford shire. Joseph Woodhouse married Dorothy Buck and had children, Samuel, Lemuel, John, Daniel and 4 daughters.

One of the Gilberts that married Hannah Woodhouse made the first Dutch wheel used in this country, this one had children.

Hannah was married to Mr. Gilbert in Boston, he came before she died and as they were engaged she came with the intention of marrying him as she did at Boston.

Deciphered from the original by Mr. Headly or Mr. Trumbull of Hartford-some words impossible to understand, blanks or certain characters fill the space.

Herton, Sept. 23, 1732.

Dear Children:

I haveing ~~bee~~ a long time bin without hearing from you makes me very uneasy to know how you all doe and much more, if it were possible to see you. I beg of you to let me have a particular account of your health and affairs and how you live and how you are contented in a strange land. I am nowea widow my husband has been dead two years and I have the rents of the farm at hollow oak in which is about pounds a year to live upon, for my life and your sister Anne and her husband are comen to live in Hertford shire near us and I live with them. I thank God I have my health pretty well, but my hearing and eyesight failes which I cannot expect no other considering my age. I desire you not to miss the first opportunity of leteing me hear from you for my heart lies much to know how you all doe, and besides let me particularly hear from each of you which will be a great satisfaction to me, my dear children, if please God we never see one another in this world I hope we shall all meet in heaven which will be the prayer of your agedmother with Dear respects and hearty love to you all as if particularly named, till death,

Phebe Phillips.

Dear brother:

In New England and ere hear of your wife and 4 children. Dated July 1736 and I should be very glad to hear from

(G. B. May 6'97 5 cop)

you and your family hoping they are all in good health as I and my family are at this time(blessed by God) my family by my wife and me consist of 7 sons and 2 daughters with a great household of servants. I thank God I live pretty well in old England. I rent about 150 pound in year and I should be very glad to entertain you, your wife and children wi h me in old England. I hope I need to remember ye to be sure to live in ye love and favor of God. I desire you to send my kind love to my sister Hanna and her husband and cousin and my love to Judy and her husband. I hope you are all in health and I long and long again to hear from you all. My love again and again to you, your wife and cossens, farewell, farewell,

from your brother,

McWoodhouse.

Dearly beloved brother and sisters

as if particularly named accept my kind and most hearty love. I have been most of my time in Dudley since you went to New England, but my husband and I are now settled in a pleasant home in a village nearvoss where I keep market every ~~xxxxxxx~~Thursday with millinary goods. I had in Dudley a deal of alteration in trade and loss of relation and acquaintance and my father in law dieing made my have a mind to ~~xxxxxxxx~~ remove into heriford Shire & and I am well contented now I am among my relations and we are often talking of you and wishing for your company amongst us. When I go to nunmouth fair brother Joseph and Judith old friends and I have generally a long chat about them and they wish me to give their love to them especially Mrs. Jewell that is now married to Mr.
(one line almost obliterated)

Angel in Mrs. Berry Barron Miss Beby Williams ine married her aunt is dead and left her all cousin philpot is lately comen your way he is married to Miss Jaune but cant confine himself to live at home people imagine he has a wife in New England, do pray let us know how it is -- if you knew anything of the matter when I left Dudley cousen Mary pride was in health but has had some difficulty and losses since she was married it it about 2 years since we came away all our uncles and aunts and some first cosens are dead that may Na lamber and to many to mention brother William was here when this letter was begun so he has writ himself brother John and Daniel not being present. I will give you a little account and I believe you may depend of the same love as from therest. John lives within two miles of us has a second wife by which he has six children ~~xxxxx~~ he lives on a farm Daniel lives at Jackson mile from fair oak where father died. He followed his trade and some farming has 4 children I have x x x x we want to know if Judith has any pray dont fail to write to us oftener than you have done and how I am comen so near Bristol and my husband often trading with jeden and other commodities there. I hope we may keep a little better corresp ndence there. Mother will not be easy till she hears of you pray God direct our minds and make us happy in his everlasting kingdom which is the constant prayer of her who with most sincere love and affection remains your loving sister. My husband joins with me in love to you all. Ann Andersen Cousin William powel is settled in Bristol a wholesale grocer he keeps a shop of grocery and we trade with him. I was down at Bristol Fair July ye 25th. He sends respects to you and when you write Direct your letter to be left with him thus:

for Mrs. Phebe Phillips at Dantonessa, Hartford Shire xx xx of Andrew Anderson to be left with me William Powell's shop, x x x without ratliff gate Bristol.

Dear brother and sister: Since this was wrote we have had the x x x x misfortune to part with our Dear mother. She died at our house was taken with a fever which took her of in 9 days time she was very severely affected and did not care to talk much there was nothing wanting to relieve her that we should doe for her but death would spare her nt longer to my great grief but I hope she is gone to the full and everlasting enjoyment of everlasting rest to which I beg God of his infinite mercy bring us all from youre

Ann Anderson

she died Oct ye 15th, 1732.

I earnestly beg to hear of you and let us know what encourgement you meet with if we should have a mind to come.

In the matter of the ancestry of Mrs. Goodwin Brown - Hayden branch of the family.

William Hayden, deputy in 1667 from Killingworth, Conn. See Colonial Records of Connecticut, Vol. 2, PP 70-71. In Capt. Mason's account of the Pequot war you will find his services, as noted by me in the Colonial war book. See also Mason's Pequot War.

Daniel Hayden, son of William, deputy 1695, 1696, 1697, 1698, and lieutenant. See Colonial Records of Connecticut, Vol. 4, PP 138-158-221-235-232-258.

Daniel Hayden, son of preceding, held no office.

Daniel Hayden, son of last preceding, was cornet October, 1753, and lieutenant 1759. See Colonial Records of Connecticut, vol. 10, P 199, and vol. 11, P 268.

John Moore is also an ancestor of Mrs. Brown and so was his father. See Colonial Record book, Vol. 1.

See also History of the Hayden family - prepared by Jabez Hayden.

The above information was furnished by Henry E. Hayden, of Wilkes Barre, Pa., a member of the Society of Colonial Wars, and was prepared by Henry E. Hayden, of Wilkes Barre, Pa., in April, 1896.

Dictated July 21, 1896, by Goodwin Brown.

(5 N 96 - 3)

In the Matter of the Hayden Family.

Nov. 2, 1896, I, Goodwin Brown, saw in the rooms of the Connecticut Historical Society, Hartford, Conn., the sword which it is said was worn by William Hayden at the Pequot battle. The inscription on the sword is as follows: "Sword worn in the Pequot war, May 1637, by Sergt. William Hayden, of Windsor, with which he cut the bowstring of an Indian and saved the life of Capt. John Mason."

In "Ancient Windsor" recently published - or within a few years - it is stated that the authenticity of this sword is well established.

(G. B. Sept. 6, 1897 5 cop)

In the Matter

of

the descendants of Robert Johnson

of New Haven, Conn., who emigrated

from Hull, England.

The following genealogical notes

were prepared by Miss Louise Tracy, of 1

York Square, New Haven, Conn.

Arranged by Goodwin Brown, esq., Sept. 6th, 1897.

G . B. June 19-6 cop)

1 York Square, New Haven.

Dear sir:

By comparing these papers, you will see that I followed Mrs. Skilton's arrangement, giving proof, when I found it. Asa(No.4) was on record here only as being baptized so I left his page to be filled in, whenever items might come up.

I neglected, however, I see, to give him his generation number, which I have now supplied. His Will in settlement of estate is not here, and I have an idea that he went to Milford and lived and died there, as his son appears on the Orange Church records, this Orange Church being an offshoot from the Milford Church. When the Church was first formed, the minister went among the different families taking the ages of parents and children and the name of wife before marriage. From that record I got the Asa(No.5) data.

An examination of the land records here also in Milford and Orange, would probably give all the Sperry wives, but I did not feel justified in putting,you to the expense, unless authorized. The trip to Milford would cost you 50 cents, with 75 cents per hour for my search after getting there. The Orange trip would be about 40 cents.

I can,I think, carry out the Johnson line here for the same I charged for the Sperry,($5) making $10 for both. I can look up, in the Colonizal records, here, the service of each ancestor, but I would advise that you leave that until your

lines are all run out as it would be less expensive to look them all up at once.

Please return the Skilton leaf as I have notes on other side.

Jan. 23-07

Hastily,

(Signed) Louise Tracy.

When births and deaths are not given, they are not to be found on Town Records. Most of the work was done from Church and [illegible]ite records.

(G.B.-June19-5 cop)

Dear Sir:

I send you the Johnson data, made up, a large part, from Probate Records. I've had Woodbridge and Orange Records searched, but got very little.

If youcame to heare the matter carried farther I will go to Milford, and may find some of the missing dates there.

I've got a clue to Mehitable Sperry (wife of Jonathan) and can carry her line, with its ramifications, back to the settlers also Amy Wilmot, Abigail Cooper, and Sarah Hall. This would give you several ancestors among the New Haven Settlers, one, I think, a Pequot Soldier.

I think, I could get it all Mehitable, Amy, Abigail and Sarah's lines back to settlers for about $10.

The price for this and the Sperry line already sent is $10.

Hastily yours,

Louise Tracy.

(Feb.6-97)

(G. B. Sept. 6-97)-5 cop)

In the matter

of

the descendants of Robert Johnson,

of New Haven, who emigated from Hull, Eng.

- - - -

He married December , 1664, Sarah Hall, who was baptized at New Haven August 9th, 1646. She was a member of the New Haven Church in 1685.

William Johnson made his Will March 3, 1716. It was proved August 6th, 1716.

In this Will he mentions sons, William, Isaac (Isaac's wife) and children)John, Samuel, Ebenezer and Jacob; daughters Mary Bishop, Abigail Lines, Sarah(Norton ?) Lydia Andrews and Elizabeth Hotchkiss.

See New Haven Provate Records, vol. 4, page 411.
Tuttle Genealogy, page 666.
Davis History of Wallingford, page 832.
New Haven Town Records Vol. 1.
" " Church Records, vol. 1.

3. Isaac Johnson (Deacon) born Oct. 27th, 1672, died Oct. 23rd, 1750.

See abstract of Will page 4. His will was dated Nov. 6th, 1748 and proved November 1750. He married (first) April 25th, 1699, Abigail Cooper who was born October 3rd, 1679 and who died December 6th, 1724) . He married (2d) November 27th, 1723, Sarah Osborne.

In his Will he mentions wife Sarah, sons, Isaac, Ezra Obed and David; daughters, Rachel Wilmont, Lois Beecher and Abigail Sperry. He left fifteen pounds to Church in the 8th Division (Woodbridge).

On the North Wall of Grove Street Cemetery, New Haven, Conn., is an inscription, as follows:

"Abigail"
the wife of Capt. Isaac Johnson,
died December ye 6th, 1724, aged
45 years; also his daughter Ennis
died September 5th, 1725, aged 23 years. "

Capt. Isaac Johnson wasprobably an officer.

See New Haven Town Records, vol. 1
New Haven Probate Records, vol. 9.
New Haven Probate Records, vol. 7, page 693.

4. Obed Johnson, born at New Haven, July 27th, 1714; died at New Haven 1760. His will was made February 8th, 1760 and was proved May, 1760.

See Abstract of Will page 5. He married (first) Anne Wilmont January 5th, 1737-8. He married(second) Rebekah ( ). In his Will mentions wife, Rebekah, son Obed, daughters, Dorcas, Abigail, Amy and Eunice. Leaves his gun and sword to son Obed.

See New Haven Town Records, vol. 1.
" " Probate Records, vol. 9 page 341.

5. Obed Johnson born died at Woodbridge, Conn., in 1790. Will dated November 19th, 1789. Will proved January 7th, 1790. See abstract of Will page 5.

Married Mary born died 1794. The Will mentions Mary, sons, Isaac, Thaddeus and Obed, and daughters Mary, Rebekah and Eunice. Will was proved January 7th, 1790.

See New Haven Probate Records, vol. 16, page 609.

also vol. 17, page.

Mary Johnson, widow of Obed made a will April 24th, 1792, which was proved August 18th, 1794. This will mentions daughter Sarah and Rebekah.

New Haven Probate Records Vol. 17, page 156.

Obed Johnson wasprobably an officer in the train band.

6. Eunice Johnson, born May 9th, 1772, probably at Woodbridge. She died at Orange, Conn., January 7th, (?) 1834. She married Asa Sperry who was born Feby. 22d, 1769(probably at Woodbridge) died at Orange, Conn., in 1836. See abstract of Will in Sperry papers.

See Orange Church Records, New Haven, Church Records, & New Haven Land Records.

(See Deed on page 6.)

Asa Sperry, jr., and Eunice, his wife, of Woodbridge, sells land to Elias Clarke, of Milford, May 26th, 1801.

New Haven Land Records, vol. 49, page 346.

This Asa being junior shows that his father Asa was alive in 1801. I find on Woodbridge Church records

Asa Sperry and Sarah Johnson were married April 2d, 1761, Society Amity.

Sarah was probably the mother of Asa Jr.

I would like the Brooklyn correspondent's authority for giving Esther Hull or Tuttle as the mother of Asa, jr.

Asa and Aseth were the same.

(G. B. Sept. 4, 1897) 5 cop.

In the Matter

of

the descendants of Richard Sperry,

one of the founders of New Haven.

— — — —

Haven, they were obliged to abscond.

They secreted themselves for some time, at a Cave near the top of West Rock, still known as "Judges Cave". It was an excellent position for observing any approach to the mountains, or any vessel entering the harbor.

Richard Sperry supplied them with daily food, sometimes carrying it himself, and at other times sending it by his boys with instructions to leave it on a certain stump, from which the judges would take it.

Frightened by a wild animal at the Cave, they finally took refuge at Sperry's house. While there they were surprised with an unexpected visit from their pursuers, whom they espied at a distance;,as the cause way to the house lay through a morass on each side of which was an impassible swamp, making the house a "Moated Manor" the only one, so far as known in New England.

The Kings officers being seen by the Judges, when several rods from the house, they had time to make their escape.

References.

Stiles "History of the Judges".

Cogswell "The Regicides".

"Tuttle Genealogy ". p. 664.

"History and Antiquities of of New Haven. "

340 Elm Street.

New Haven.

Dear Mr. Brown.

I found that there was a Sperry bible which had just the missing links, which the records here did not give, so I kept your papers until I could get access to those records. You will see that they fill in the gap beautifully.

I gave work in exchange for them, so will be obliged to charge you $1 but you will see that it is well worth it.

A search of the Milford Records would, I think, give additional facts.

Sincerely yours,

Louise Tracy.

June 23-97

1. Richard Sperry, born

died at New Haven, Conn. 1667.

Married Dennis ----- born died

She joined the New Haven Church in 1661.

CHILDREN.

2. John, b. Jan. 9, 1649, New Haven.
3. Mary, " Mch. 14, 1650 " "
4. Richard " Jan. 20, 1652 " " m. Martha Mansfield
5. Hester " Sept. 1654
6. Nathaniel " Aug. 13, 1656
7. Thomas, " July 13, 1658.
8. Child " 1661
9. Ebenezer, " July 1663.
10. Daniel " 1665.
11. Joseph " July 24, 1668, says Tuttle, but inventory taken and father's Will proved June 13, 1667.

In this Will made December 28th, 1666, he mentions eldest son, Richard. Amount of estate £ 285; s 16 d 10.

References:

"Tuttle Genealogy" page 684.

New Haven Church and Town Records,

" " Probate Records, vol. 1, pg.138.

(4) Richard Sperry, born at New Haven, Jan. 20, 1652; died 1734 at New Haven.

Married December 18, 1680, Martha Mansfied, born at New Haven, April 18, 1660.

She joined the Church at New Haven Nov. 21, 1688 and her husband joined December 25, 1689.

Richard Sperry in Will made August 10, 1730, proved June 3, 1734, mentions wife Martha, and children John, Moses, Joseph, James, Stephen, Jonathan, Martha, Mercy, Silence and Mary.

CHILDREN.

12. Moses, b. Jan. 7, 1681.
13. John " Mch. 3, 1683.
14. Martha, " Jan. 5, 1685.
15. Joseph " Oct. 29, 1687.
16. Jonathan " July 7, 1696.
17. Stephen, " Feb. 17, 1698.
18. Silence " June 15, 1701.
19. Mercy " Jan. 9, 1702.
20. Japhet, " Feb. 23, 1705.
21. Richard, " Aug. 12, 1710.
22. Rubin " Nov. 12, 1711.
23. Dorcas " July 22, 1713.
24. Jabesh " Jan. 31, 1714.
25. Elizabeth " Nov. 11, 1716.

26. Gilead b. Feb. 20, 1719.

References:

"Tuttle Genealogy" page 684.

New Haven Town and Church Records.

" " Probate Records, vol. 6, page 140.

(16) Jonathan Sperry born at New Haven July 7,1696, died April 16, 1769, aged 72 years. Married Mehitable.

CHILDREN.

27.	Jonathan	b.	baptized	Nov. 21, 1742.
28.	Richard	"	"	" " "
29.	Aseth(Asa)	"	"	" " "
30.	Mehitable.	"	"	" " "
31.	John	"	"	Nov. 21, 1742.
32.	Stephen	"	"	Mch. 8, 1746-7

Jonathan Sperry, in will, made Mch. 31, 1769, mentions wife Mehitable, children of son Jonathan, dec'd. sons Richard, Stephen, Asa and Samuel, and daughter, Mehitable Johnson.

References.

New Haven, 1st Church Records.

" " Probate Records, vol. 10, page 176.

(29) Asa Sperry, baptized at New Haven.
Nov. 21, 1742 died May, 1823.
Married Esther (or Hester) Hull - who
died Mch. 1820 aged 73.

Baptized with five brothers and sisters, at 1st Church New Haven, Nov. 21, 1742. Name written on Church Records (the spelling of which is careless as Aseth. Called Asa in his father's will.

Called Asa also in the family bible which says he died in May, 1823, aged 85. " My mother" says the writer, "died March 1820, aged 73"; does not give her name.

Family tradition says she was Esther or Hester Hull.

Children of Asa &

33.	Asa, b. Feby. 22, 1769,	died April 17, 1838,	aged	69
34.	Lucenab.	died Mch. 6, 1818	"	38
35.	Roger	died Sept. 12, 1818	"	36
36.	John	died 1829	"	62
37.	Sally	died 1847	"	77
38.	Stephen	died 1853	"	76
39	Pitkin	died 1853	"	78
40.	Enos b. Jan. 20, 1790	died Aug. 20, 1873		

The above is copied from the bible of Enos Sperry.

This bible record agrees, so far as it goes, with what is fouhd in New Haven Probate and Church Records and Orange Records.

N. B. Sperry writes, "Asa Sperry died aged 70, at Seymour, Ct. and was buried at Woodbridge. His wife, Eunice, died July 4, 1838 and was buried at Woodbridge."

That is all he knows.

References:

New Haven Church Records.

(33) Asa Sperry, born Feb. 22, 1769.
died at Orange , Conn. 1838.
Married Eunice Johnson, born May 9, 1772,
died.

Children.

41.	Kneeland T.	b.	Aug. 7, 1790	probably at Orange.
42.	Amanda	"	Mch. 14, 1794	"
43.	Erastus	"	Apr. 21, 1797	"
44.	Ransom	"	May 24, 1799	"
45.	Isaac	"	Dec. 12,1801	"
46.	Asa Ellsworth	"	Apr. 2, 1804	"
47.	Eunice	"	June 25, 1807	"
48.	Bennet Wells	"	Oct. 28, 1809	"
49.	Adaline	"	Aug. 28, 1812.	"
50.	Emmeline	"	" " "	"
51.	Atlanta	"	June 6, 1795.	"

In Will made Jan. 4, 1836, proved Dec. 26, 1838, mentions wife Hannah, (probably second wife) children Kneeland, Erastus, Ransom, Isaac J. Asa C. Bennettt W. Amanda Eunice Bradley, Adaline Beach and Emeline Sperry.

References:

Orange Records.

New Haven Probate Records.

Mansfield.

1. Richard and Gilian Mansfied came from Exeter, Devonshire England, and settled at New Haven in 1639. He was steward for Mr. Marshall. After his death his widow married Alexander Field, a baker, and came into possession of the Evance lot on College Street, New Haven. She devised it to the children of her son Joseph Mansfield. The Farnam and Durfee Dormitories and the Battell Chapel of Yale College stands on the ground.

Children.

2. Joseph b. died about 1701.
3. Moses " 1640 (Major) " Oct. 1703.
4. Rachel x "

References.

"Tuttle Genealogy" Page 667.

New Haven Probate Records.

x Others names not known.

(2) Joseph Mansfield born about 1636 Eng. died, Nov. 15, 1692 ab 56 married Mary abt 1657 who died about 1705:

Children.

5. Mary b. 1658 New Haven.

(Dictated G. B. Ap 15 99 - 6 cop)

The following records were revised and certified by Mr. George Tolman, of Concord, Mass., May 28, 1896. Mr. Tolman is regarded as an authority by the Concord Library. Among other things, he says:

"I have consulted, in making my tracing of the Concord Browns, only the original sources of information, that is the municipal registers and records of Concord and Cambridge, etc.; the wills, administrations, partitions of estates, etc., in the probate registry; the deeds and mortgages recorded in the county register of deeds; the records of the civil and criminal courts and the like; and the vital records of any other town or county to which any of the things appear to point. The records are often quite imperfect and some inferences have to be drawn - for instance, there is no record of the birth of Thomas, 2nd, to prove that he was the son of Thomas, or that he was born in 1651; but as long as the first Thomas is alive the other is always called Thomas, Jr., in the tax lists and such like documents; he inherits a large share of the lands of the first Thomas, and his gravestone shows that he must have been born in 1651. I am very shy of using printed genealogical works, and when

I do find myself obliged to depend upon them from inability to get at the original record, I always quote their authority.

There seems not to be room for much amplifying of the typewritten record you sent, and which I return herewith. Some of the dates given merely in years can be filled out from the printed records which are accessible to you, and I can from my own m.s. genealogy of the family fill out any of the lines you may wish to follow."

Mr. Tolman also writes as follows, under date of January 19, 1897:

"You asked if Rev. Edmund Brown's will stated explicitly that he & Thomas were brothers. It does not, but they are many times referred to as such in the old records of Sudbury-lived in the same house at the first - and all tradition of the places makes the fact practically certain. Edmund in his will bequeaths his lands and housing at Bury St. Edmunds to relatives who had remained in Old England, which shows that he came from there, though not necessarily that he was born there. I will endeavor to get full copy of will if you so desire. I do not know of any Ephraim Brown, other than your great grandfather who could have been in Temple, N.H.

and of military age in the revolutionary war."

See also Potter's Old Families of Concord - pages7 and 64, and other references, where the genealogy is carefully traced.

References are made to the Concord Register of Births, Marriages and Deaths, 1635-1850, unless otherwise stated.

I have not examined the Massachusetts Colonial Records as they are not yet printed.

For Edmund Brown, see Quincy's History of Harvard University, Vol 1, p 419.

The name Brown has a final "e" as shown by all the early records. For convenience, the ordinary spelling is given.

(1) Thomas Brown, born _____, in Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, England. This is shown by the will of Rev. Edmund Brown in Middlesex Probate Registry. The Rev. Edmund Brown was a brother of Thomas. They came to New England together in 1638. The two brothers were among the original proprietors of Sudbury, Mass., where Edmund was the first minister of the church in town, and is now stated to have been one of the most distinguished clergymen of the time.

(See Mather's Magnalia, Hudson's History of Sudbury, p 35, Savage's Geneelogical Dictionary and Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit.)

In the "Annals of Sudbury, Wayland & Maynard," published in 1891, Page 5, it appears that the Town of Sudbury was named by the Rev. Edmund Brown. "The name ordered by the court is that of an old English town, in the County of Suffolk, near the Parish of Bury St. Edmunds, at or near which place it is supposed the Browns may have dwelt. It is not improbable that the name was given by Rev. Edmund Brown, the first minister of Sudbury, who sold lands in the district of Lanham to Thomas Read, his nephew, and he it is supposed may have also named that locality to from Lavenham, Eng., a place between Sudbury and Bury St. Edmunds. The place, though spelled Lavanham, is pronounced Lanham in England (Waters). The proximity of Sudbury and Lavenham to what was probably the original home of Mr. Brown together with the fact that he was an early owner of the lands at Lanham, and a prominent man at the settlement, affords at least a strong presumption that Mr. Edmund Brown named both Sudbury and Lanham."

In the same work, page 18, the following appears in

relation to the Rev. Edmund Brown:

He "came from England in 1637, and according to Mather was ordained and in actual service in that country before he came to America. He was a Freeman of Massachusetts Bay Colony May 13, 1640. He married about 1645 Ann, widow of John Loveren, of Watertown, but left no children. He was a member of the Synod that established the 'Cambridge Platform", 1646-1648; was on the council that met in 1657 to settle difficulties in Rev. Mr. Stone's church, Hartford; preached the Artillery election sermon in 1666, and was preacher to the company in 1666; and his name is attached to the testimony of the seventeen ministers against the proceedings of the three elders of the first church of Boston about 1669. Mr. Brown was quite a land owner, his real estate, as it is supposed, amounting to 300 acres. His library was for those times quite valuable, containing about 180 volumes. He left fifty pounds to establish a grammar school in Sudbury; he also left one hundred pounds to Harvard College".

In a map of the first roads and house lots in Sudbury, page 38, appear the house lots of Thomas Brown and Edmund Brown.

Page 63, Edmund Brown is referred to again as"a scholarly and subtantial minister, as well as an honored and useful citizen."

In the Early History of Middlesex County, by Drake, Boston, 1880, Vol 2, p, 468, it appears that Edmund Brown "was of ~~those~~ those who were in the actual exercise of the ministry when he left England. Johnson speaks of him as "a godly and able minister of the word". He was much honored in social life, being on terms of intimacy with the family of Governor Leverett. He was a member of the Synod that established the Cambridge Platform 1646-1648, and was on the Council that met October, 1657, to settle the difficulties in Rev. Mr. Stone's church, at Hartford. Besides large grants as an original proprietor of Sudbury, he received from the General Court several meadows in Framingham. His landed estates, acquired and by gift and purchse could not have been less than 300 acres.

His house, called in his will "Brunswick", that is 'House by the Stream', was of ample dimensions, two stores high, and well furnished."

Thomas Brown came to Concord in 1640. He had there a wife

Bridget, whose family name is not known. He removed to Cambridge about 1682, and died there November 3, 1688. His wife Bridget died at Concord March 5, 1680. His will shows his children to have been:

(2) Boaz, born Feb. 14, 1641-2; married, first Nov. 8, 1664, Mary Winship; second, October 10, 1716, Mrs. Abigail Wheat; died April 7, 1724.

(3) Jabez, birth not recorded; died 1692; married Hannah _____, first wife; Deborah _____, second wife.

(4) Mary, born March 26, 1646; married June 21, 1669, William Woodward, at Chelmsford.

(5) Eleazer, born July 6, 1649; married Feb. 9, 1674-5, Dianh Spaulding, at Chelmsford.

(6) Thomas, born 1651 - birth not recorded; married Ruth (Vinton) Wheeler (Jones), Nov. 12, 1677. He died April 4, 1718.

Thomas Brown (6), son of Thomas (1) and Bridget, his wife, was born 1651. He died April 4, 1718, at Concord, Mass., aged 67 years, p 94. His gravestone is at Concord, Mass. He was married to Ruth Jones Nov. 12, 1677, p 20 by _____. Ruth Jones was the widow of Ephraim Jones, whom he married May 7,

1773, p 73. She was the daughter of Capt. Thomas Wheeler and his wife Ruth. Her birth is not recorded. After the death of her husband, Thomas Brown, she married Capt. Jonathan Prescott, Aug.18, 1718, p 93. She died Feb. 9, 1740, p 144. They had the following children:

(7) Ruth, born Feb. 8, 1678-9; married Samuel Jones, Nov. 1[illegible], 1698; died March 22, 1764.

(8) Mary, born Nov. 18, 1681; married John Hunt; died July 14, 1750.

(9) Rebecca, born March 5, 1683-4; married Sept. 26, 1704, Jonathan Hubbard, of Watertown.

(10) Ephraim, born April 21, 1689; married August 28, 1719, Hannah Wilson; died Feb 6, 1749-1750.

(11) Thomas, born Aug. 28, 1686; married Nov. 22, 1709, Hannah Potter; died March 15, 1717-1718.

(12) Elizabeth, born March 8, 1691-2; married Sept. 22, 1713, Jonathan Hartwell, at Watertown: died Dec. 28, 1718.

Thomas Brown 2nd was for many years (1689-1700 and from 1704-1709) Town Clerk of Concord, and was "Selectman" from 1706-1709. (See Shattuck's History of Concord, pp 233-234). He was also an Ensign of the local military company, as he appears with that title on the records first in 1702, but the

date of his commission is not known. He enrolled in the service against the Indians in Phillip's War, Dec. 2, 1675 (See Massachusetts Archives, Vol LXVIII, folio 85), and was wounded at the fight at Narragansett Fort a few days later (16th, it is supposed). (See also Bodge's Soldiers of King Phillip's War, pages 123--24) This was before he became an Ensign. The family were all farmers, and very extensive landholders. Some of the land granted to the first Thomas Brown did not pass out of the hands of his descendents until within the last half-dozen years (1896). Several of his descendents of later generations were active patriots in the Revolutionary war. One of them, namely, Jonas, was severely wounded at the Concord fight.

Thomas Brown (11), son of Thomas (6), was born Aug. 28, 1686, p 35. He died March 13, 1717-1718 in his 32nd year, p 94. He was married to Hannah Potter, Nov. 22, 1709, by Rev. Mr. Joseph Estabrookes, p 74. Hannah Potter was the daughter of John Potter, and Grace (Brooks), and was born Dec. 20, 1690, page 34. She died Dec.1, 1782, aged 92 years, p 417. After the death of her first husband she married Simon Davis, June 1, 1719. Thomas Brown and Hannah, his wife, had children as follows.

(13) Ephraim, born Nov. 7, 1710; died Oct. 9, 1788; married June 20, 1732/ Abigail Wheeler.

(14) Timothy, born Aug. 17, 1712; married Rebecca Farrar.

(15) Luke, born Nov. 3, 1714.

(16) Hannah, born Dec. 6, 1716.

All but Ephraim died unmarried.

Ephraim (13) (Deacon), son of Thomas (11) and Hannah, his wife, was born Nov. 7, 1710, p 75. He died Oct. 9, 1788, aged 78 years, p 323. He was Selectman from 1730 to 1733 (See Shattuck's History of Concord, p 234). He was Deacon from 1744 until his death (Shattuck's History of Concord, p 194). He was married to Abigail Wheeler, June 20, 1732, by Justice Flint, p 130. Abigail Wheeler was the daughter of Edward and Sarah, his wife, and was born Nov. 1, 1712. She died Dec. 14, 1794, aged 84 years, p 323. Ephrain Brown and Abigail, his wife, had children as follows:

(17) Abigail, born April 9, 1733; married Nov. 1, 1753, Thomas Hubbard.

(18) Ephraim, born April 7, 1735; died Feb. 6, 1736-7.

(19) Edward, born Feb. 15, 1736-7; married, first, Mary Brown Jan. 15, 1761; second, in 1780 Buelah Hosmer.

(20) Thankful, born Dec. 16, 1740; married July 6, 1758, Edward Wright; died Sept. 9, 1776.

(21) Ephraim, born Dec. 20, 1742; married Sybil Patterson; died Jan. 18, 1812.

(22) Hannah, born April 1, 1745; died June 18, 1745.

(23) Sarah, born Sept. 25, 1746; married Samuel Farrar.

(24) Thomas, born March 25, 1749; never married; died April 25, 1774.

(25) Samuel (Lieut), born Sept. 18, 1752; married Elizabeth Brown; died Oct. 29, 1819.

Ephraim Brown (21), born Dec. 20, 1742, p 157, son of Ephraim Brown (13) and Abigail, his wife; died Jan. 18, 1812. Ephraim Brown and his wife are buried in Litchfield, Herkimer Co., N.Y. In the Spring of 1908, I visited the old cemetery at Litchfield, and found a stone on which was the following:

"In memory of Ephraim Brown, who died June 16, 1812, aged 70 years" - Also "Sybil, wife of Ephraim Brown, died September 11, 1810, aged 64 years."

Another stone contains the following: "In memory of George and Jeremiah, sons of Ephraim and Philomena Brown, died June 2, 1820, aged 1 mo and 19 days."

Another stone contains the following: "In memory of Ephraim Brown, Jr., who died May 14, 1748, aged 45 years."

Another stone contains the following: "In memory of Sybil Ester, daughter of Ephraim and Philemens Brown, died Sept. 14, 1828, aged 19 years."

On March 31, 1768, Ephraim Brown was married to Sybil Patterson, of Concord, Mass., by the Rev. William Emerson, p 241. Sybil Patterson was born July 24, 1745. She died Sept.10, 1810. Blood's History of Temple, N.H., Boston, 1860, shows the following in relation to Ephraim Brown: "During the War of the Revolution he was one of a committee to fix the prices of staple articles, for example, 'a mug of flip with half a pint of West Indie rum, 1 s. 2d.'" Page 83. This is interesting as showing the attempts which were made during the Revolution to fix the prices of staplearticles, when the tendency owing to the depreciated currency was for prices to constantly rise. Ephraim Brown's Revolutionary services are shown as follows: He marched from Temple to Cambridge at the time of the Lexington alarm - the beginning of the American Revolution - April 19, 1775, Page 97. He was on the committee of public safety in the Colony of New Hampshire, and on

April 12th this committee resolved ; "That we the subscribers do hereby profess our entire willingness at the risk of our lives our fortunes with arms to oppose the hostile attempts of the British fleets and armies against the United American Colonies whenever and to such a degree as such attempts of Britain may require, Page 105. In October, 1776, he was one of nine soldiers who went on an alarm to Ticonderoga, - Page 107. In July, 1777, he was "one of seventeen men who marched to Bennington in Captain S. Parker's Company, Col. N. Nichol's regiment, General John Stark's Brigade." Page 115. May 21, 1770, he was on a committee to repair the "meeting house.". At this time he was a member of the Congregational Church. His civil services were as follows: 1775 and 1784 he was Selectman, and in 1786 he was Constable,- Pages 188 and 189.

He left Temple about 1793 for Litchfield, Herkimer co., N.Y. On Page 88, the removal of a number of families from Temple is referred to as follows: "In or about the year 1790 some nine or ten families of Baptists, most of the south part of the town, sold out their possessions and removed to a new town in New York, about 90 miles up the Mohawk, where the other inhabitants were mostly Dutch people, who numbered far more than

the English. In a few years they got the town incorporated by the name of Lytchfield, and the Dutch being illiterate, the Yankees were elected to all the town offices; but after a while they complained that they paid the most taxes and ought to hold more offices, which was a fair agreement, so all turned in and elected a full board of Dutch Selectmen, who took an invoice and met to make taxes. "Well, says one, 'Let's begin with the Yankees'. 'What shall Eb Drury pay?' 'Oh, he's one clever man, he shall pay one tollar.' 'Nat. Ball?' 'He shoat my bruder Hans; he shall pay two tollar.' '_____ _____?' 'He ish one tam rascal; he shall pay four tollar'. And so on through the list; but none would pay his tax, and they had to hire the Yankeses to make them over."

Referring to Ephraim Brown's services in the History of Temple, see particularly pages 101 and 257 as to proof thatthe Ephraim Brown mentioned as a soldier was the same Ephraim Brown who lived in Temple. As to number of children, see Page 257, and list of persons at time of war, p 101.

Ephraim Brown's children were as follows: (See Temple History of New Hampshire) Names and dates of birth of children taken fromthe records of the first town book.

(26) Sybil, born Feb. 16, 1769; died May 1, 1837.

(27) Abigail, born July 18, 1770; died _____.

(28) Ephraim, born Aug. 6, 1772; died Sept. 3, 1775.

(29) Thomas, born Aug. 25, 1775; date of death _____.

(30) Ethan, born Sept. 25, 1776; died Oct. 20, 1777.

(31) Elizabeth, born Jan. 13, 1779; died Sept. 10, 1811.

(32) Rebecca, born Dec. 17, 1780; died Oct. 16, 1852.

(33) Ephraim, born Feb. 14, 1783; died May 14, 1838.

(34) Polly, born Jan. 10, 1785; died Jan. 17, 1853.

(35) Milly, born Jan. 24, 1787; died _____.

(36) Thomas, born Aug. 20, 1788; died May 22, 1805.

(37) Amasa, and (38) Amaziah, born Dec. 9, 1790.

Amasa died, March, 1863.

Amaziad died Dec.12, 1799.

(39) James, born Dec. 10, 1793; died March 7, 1795.

Amasa Brown, (37), son of Ephraim Brown (21), and Sybil, his wife, was born at Temple, N.H., Dec. 9, 1790. He married, first, Phoebe Stevens, sister of Jared Stevens, who married his sister Polly, March 1813, in Litchfield, Herkimer Co., N.Y., and removed to Henderson, Jefferson Co. Amasa Brown, and Phoebe, his wife, had the following children:

(40) Horace, born Dec. 23, 1813; died in Adams, March 30, 1890.

(41) Lucy Ann, born July 9, 1815; died Jan 28, 1818.

(42) Pamela, born Sept. 15, 1817; died July 5, 1820.

(43) Patterson, born July 14, 1819; died March 12, 1820.

Amasa Brown married for his second wife Sally Goodwin Hopkins, daughter of Judge Jesse Hopkins, of Henderson, Dec. 4, 1820. She was born Sept. 14, 1797, and she died Nov. 14, 1856. Amasa Brown and Sally Goodwin Brown, his wife, had the following children:

(44) Thomas Goodwin, born Aug. 27, 1821; died at Henderson, Feb. 17, 1879.

(45) Elizabeth Hopkins, born Nov. 16, 1822; died Dec. 28, 1845.

(46) James Sheldon, born April 19, 1824; died Adams, March 30, 1894.

(47) Arthur Jesse, born April 12, 1828; died Adams, Sept. 7, 1881.

(48) Catherine Sarah, born May 23, 1830; died April 4, 1895.

Amasa Brown married for his third wife Mrs. Florence Wallace, widow of Judge Wallace, late of Ft. Covington, Franklin Co.,

N. Y., May 4, 1859. She died in Adams, Jefferson Co., a little later than 1870.

Thomas Goodwin Brown (44), son of Amasa Brown and Sally Goodwin Hopkins, was born Aug. 27, 1821; died Feb 17, 1879. He married Josephine Cornlelia Keith, of Henderson. They had the following children.

(49) Elizabeth Robbins, born Dec. 13, 1845; married Thurston G. Packer.

(50) Catherine Josephine, born Dec. 13, 1845; died 1879.

(51) Nathaniel Goodwin, born April 5, 1852.

(52) Jesse, Born Oct. 12, 1858.

(53) Sarah A., born Nov. 25, 1862.

Goodwin Brown (51) Son of Thomas Goodwin Brown and Josephine, his wife, was born April 5, 1852; married Lillian Spencer Woodhouse, daughter of Col. Levi Woodhouse, of Hartford, Conn., Oct. 4, 1877. Goodwin Brown, and Lillian, his wife, have on child.

(54) Fraser, born June 10, 1879.

Elizabeth Robbins Brown (49), born Dec. 13, 1845, married Oct 11, 1864, Thurston G. Packer. They had the following children:

(55) Flavius A., born Aug. 21, 1865; died Feb. 25, 1866.

(56) Flavius A., born Feb. 3, 1867.

(57) Goodwin T., born Nov. 1, 1869.

(58) Josephine C. born April 8, 1872.

(59) Jesse H., born Jan. 13, 1882.

Copy of inscriptions on tombstones in Old Central Church grave-yard, Hartford. These tombstones were erected to mark the graves of the Hopkins and Goodwin ancestors of Goodwin Brown - copy taken from book prepared by Charles J.Hoadley of the State Library of Connecticut about October 22,1895.

In Memory of
Doctr Asa Hopkins
who died Dec.4th 1805
aged 48 years

Also of
Edward
Son of
Asa & Abigail Hopkins
who died
April 18th 1799
aged 13 months.

In In Memory of of
Mrs Rebecca Hopkins
Wife of
Mr Asa Hopkins
and daughter of the late
Benjamin Payne Esq
who died September 17th
1791
Aged 29 Years

Mrs
Hannah
Wells aged
60 years died
August Ye 5th Day
1683

(She was widow successively of John Pantry and Thomas Wells - Married to the latter June 23 1654)

In Memory of
Mrs Sally Hopkins
wife of
Mr Daniel Hopkins
and daughter of the late
Benjamin Payne Esq
who died December 25th
A. 1796
in the 28th year
of her age

In Memory of
Three Infants
Children of
Daniel & Hannah
Hopkins.
a daughter died
August 28th 1799
aged 11 days

Edgar died July 2nd 1803
aged 9 months
Joseph died Nov.22nd
1807 aged 13 months

In Memory of
Mrs Betsy Hopkins
wife of
Mr Jesse Hopkins
who departed this life
Feb 14th A.1799
in the 26th year of her age

(She was the youngest daughter of Nathaniel Goodwin, born July 27,1773)

Sacred
to the Memory of
Mr Daniel Goodwin
who died April y° 23
A.1790
Aged 44 Years

Hannah Goodwin
Wife of
James Goodwin
died Febry 22
1806
Aged
45

In Memory of
Manning Son of
Lieu^{t} James & Mrs
Hannah Goodwin
died July ye 6th 1739
Aged six weeks.

In Memory of
Mrs Abigail Good-
wine Relict of Capt.
Daniel Goodwine
who died Decemb^{r} 26th
1776 in the 73^{d}
Year of her Age

Grace is a Source of Joys Untried
By faith she lived-by faith she Dyed.
And when ye Solemn hour was come.
Serene she left her Earthly home.

Angels that saw her flight was High.
Bent Down their Course from Yonder Sky.
Each to attend on her way.
And Lead her to the Realms of Day.

I Memory of
Dap^{t} Daniel
Goodwin Who
died Jany ye 6th
1772 in ye 67th
Year of his Age.

Blessed are ye dead
that die in ye Lord

Here lies the Body
of Mrs Dorothy
Goodwin wife of
Lieu't Daniel Good-
win who Died
October the 7th
A:D. 1746
Aged 26 Years

(She was daughter of John and Abigail (Blackleach) Olcott, born Feb.18, 1704, married, first Timothy Bigelow - second November 6,1745, she became the second wife of Daniel Goodwine)

Here lies the Body
of Mrs Sarah
Goodwin wife of
Ens'n Nathaniel
Goodwin who died
Jany the 2nd 1740
Aged about 60
Years

(She was 2d wife of Ens.N.G.and daughter of John Easton)

Here lies the Body
of Ens. Nathaniel
Goodwin who Dec^{d}
March y^{e} 12. A.D.
1746 Aged 79
Years

Here lies Interr'd
the Body of Mrs
Abigail Goodwin
wife of Mr Samuel
Goodwin Who
Departed this Life
Sept ye 16 1745 in y^{e}
32 yr of her Age

Surah
The wife of
Nathaniel Goodwine
of Hartford Aged
29 Years Deasased
May 8th 1676

(She was the first wife of
N.G. and daughter of John
Coles.)

In Memory of Mr
Samuel Goodwin
who died Sept 30th
1776 In the 66th Year
of his Age.

ALSO

In Memory of Mary
Goodwin Daughter of
Mr Samuel and Mrs
Lodema Goodwin Who
died May 22d 1756
In the 19th Year of
her Age

Ancestry of Fraser Brown.

1 Thomas (1) original settler.

2 Thomas (6) son of Thomas (1); Enrolled against the Indians in
King Phillip's War, December 3, 1675 (see Massachus-
3 etts Archives, Vol. LXVIII, fol. 85) and was wound-
ed at the fight at Narragansett Fort a few days later.

4 Thomas (11) son of Thomas (6)

5 Ephraim (13) son of Thomas (11)

6 Ephraim (21) son of Ephraim (13)

7 Amasa (37) son of Ephraim (21)

8 Thomas (44) son of Amasa (37)

9 Goodwin (51) son of Thomas (44)

10 Fraser (58) son of Goodwin (51)

Sketch of the Life of Goodwin Brown

Goodwin Brown was born in Henderson, Jefferson county, N. Y., April 5, 1852, where his immediate ancestors settled very early in the century. His great grandfather, Judge Jesse Hopkins, was one of the first judges of the Court of Common Pleas in that county—having been appointed by Governor Daniel D. Tompkins. Hough, in his History of Jefferson county, states that Judge Hopkins as a youth served on the staff of Lafayette in the latter's military operations in Connecticut.

Mr. Brown traces his descent through sound Puritan lineage from the earliest period of New England history. His ancestors in the direct line on his father's side came from Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, England. They were particularly prominent in Colonial times, were very extensive landholders in Massachusetts not far from Boston, and the family was among the earliest benefactors of Harvard college. His ancestors were among the founders of Hartford, New Haven and Cambridge. None settled in New England later than 1638. One of them, John Hopkins, is said to have been a son of Stephen Hopkins, a signer of the Mayflower compact. The records show that they were all prominent in Colonial and Revolutionary periods and held conspicuous positions in military and civil life. One of them, Judge Joseph Hopkins, of Waterbury, Conn., earned the distinction of having been elected to the legislature of that State forty-four times in succession. He was also a prominent Revolutionary patriot.

Mr. Brown's education was begun at the Academy in the village of Mexico, Oswego county, N. Y., and was completed at Cornell university, where he was class essayist two successive years. In college he was a member of the Psi Upsilon and Phi Kappa Psi Greek letter societies. In 1894 he was elected vice-president of the Albany Cornell Alumni Association. After leaving Cornell Mr. Brown engaged in business for a few years. In the fall of 1878 he removed to Buffalo. He was admitted to practice in the Supreme Court of this State in the spring of 1879, and in the United States Courts during the next year. January 1, 1883, Governor Cleveland appointed him pardon and extradition clerk in the governor's office—he being the second appointment of Mr. Cleveland as governor. Governor Hill reappointed him to the position on the beginning of his term in January, 1886, and again on the beginning of his second term in 1889. In 1889, upon the creation of the State Commission in Lunacy, Governor Hill appointed him one of its members. He was reappointed by Governor Flower in 1893 for a term of six years. The reappointment was bitterly opposed, and was delayed or hung up in the Senate for a period of three months by a senator, the president of the board of trustees of the Hudson River State Hospital which had recently been investigated by the commission and was shown to have been grossly mismanaged. The investigation resulted in the immediate retirement of the superintendent of the institution.

While in the governor's office Mr. Brown was actively engaged in the preparation of laws relating to criminals and criminal procedure. In 1887 he brought about a conference of representatives of the various States and territories for a unification and improvement of the extradition laws, rules and regulations, and was appointed by Governor Hill a delegate to represent the State of New York. Mr. Brown was secretary of the convention, and one of a committee to prepare a draft of a bill for presentation to Congress, providing for the regulation of the extradition of fugitives from justice. Mr. Brown was author of the law providing for the reduction of sentences of convicts for good behavior, which requires that in the case of a violation of the conditions of their discharge they shall be reimprisoned for the unexpired portion of their term; for the remission of fines in criminal cases; for revising the extradition statutes of New York, and providing that no person charged with crime shall be returned to another State unless regularly extradited; providing for the subpoenaing of witnesses and for the production of books and papers in pardon cases before the governor; providing that convicts be sentenced so that their terms shall expire during warm weather when the opportunities for employment are greater; requiring that all stenographers' minutes and all legal papers in all cases shall be transcribed and printed on paper of a standard size, in order to provide for the effectual preservation of court papers and documents; providing that no person charged with a crime punishable by life imprisonment shall be convicted upon a plea of "guilty."

He was author of the following laws while a State commissioner in lunacy: Providing for the appointment of women physicians in State hospitals for the insane; providing for the erection of free public baths in cities and towns of New York, in 1892, and in 1895, of the amendment to this act which makes the erection of such baths mandatory—Mr. Brown being the author of the first legislation on the subject had in the United States; providing for a general scheme of fire protection in all public institutions supported wholly or in part by the State; for the erection of outside iron stairways, in all hospitals in the State, public or private; providing for the appointment of a committee of a lunatic without the expense and delay of a jury, where the State is the petitioner; and a bill to prevent the contracting by county authorities for the care and maintenance of the poor.

The Medical Record of New York city, Dr. George F. Shrady, editor, under date of June 22, 1895, stated that one of the two great acts for which the Legislature of 1895 should be entitled to credit was the act providing for the erection and maintenance of free public baths.

Mr. Brown's chief claim to recognition arises, however, by reason of his efforts together with his associate commissioners in behalf of the insane poor of New York. When the State Commission in Lunacy was created, there were 2,200 insane poor in the poorhouses of the State, most of them in a state of wretchedness, degradation and squalor which affords few parallels in modern history. For years the efforts of philanthropic people had been frustrated through the selfish greed of county authorities who desired to retain the patronage and profits arising from the wretched county system of caring for the insane poor. Mr. Brown and his associates made a thorough investigation of the poorhouses of the State. Their discoveries were something appalling, and the recital of the wrongs, indignities, sufferings and cruelties, nay, of positive indecencies, were such in many instances that they were unfit for publication. Their report upon this matter submitted to the Legislature of 1890, afforded such an insight into the condition of the unhappy people in whose welfare the commission had become interested that the bill recommended by them was passed by a substantial majority, although a similar measure had been repeatedly defeated in previous years, and an end was finally put to one of the greatest legalized scandals in the chief State of the Union. The act provided for the removal to State hospitals of all the insane poor in the poorhouses as soon as sufficient accommodations should be secured.

During the next year the commission recommended an appropriation of $454,000 to complete the work of providing additional accommodations. The money was voted without dissent, and the work of providing the buildings was at once begun. These buildings were completed prior to October 1, 1893. From that period all of the insane became wards of the State, wholly supported and cared for by appropriations made by the legislature, with the exception of the insane of the counties of New York and Kings. The Legislature of 1895 provided for the care by the State of the insane of Kings county, and the Legislature of 1896, for the removal of the insane of New York county to the care of the State. Beginning with 1895, the system of special appropriations for the use of State hospitals was abolished by the legislature upon the recommendation of the commission, and a general scheme of providing for a State tax for all purposes to be disbursed under the direc-

tion of the commission was established, power being given the commission to determine the quantity and quality of supplies and the price to be paid therefor in all of the State hospitals. These reforms were not brought about, especially those relating to the management of the State hospitals for the insane, without bitter and untiring opposition on the part of the superintendents and the trustees in most instances. The commission, however, from the beginning was supported by the legislature and by each Governor, so that the system established has become in all respects the leading one in the United States, if not in the world. During this period, the condition of the State hospitals was greatly improved, although the reduction in the expenditures under the management of the commission amounted to 300,000 per year, exclusive of the counties of New York and Kings. Willard and Binghamton, which had been conducted as incurable institutions, were placed upon the curable basis and put upon the plane of the other State hospitals. This insured to all inmates the same high standard of care.

In 1894, the State Commission in Lunacy was made a constitutional body by a vote of 122 in favor to 18 against, thus placing the care of the insane directly under the control of the commission, and excluding the State Board of Charities from voice or control in this department of the State's charities. The constitution was ratified by the people and went into effect January 1, 1895.

Mr. Brown was also active with his associates in reforming abuses in the private asylums, compelling the reorganization of all and revoking the licenses of those improperly conducted and providing for the appointment of properly educated and trained physicians, and placing all such asylums on a common standard in ability to care for their inmates.

The press from time to time commented favorably on Mr. Brown's work as a member of the commission and his work generally in behalf of the State. Under date of October 2, 1893, the Utica Press said editorially:

"There has been very much said and very much done during the last few years looking toward the establishment of what has been commonly known as the system of State care for the insane. One of its objects has been to take from the almshouses of the several counties all the unfortunates suffering from mental malady and place them in State institutions where they may have the benefit of the best medical care and treatment, with proper environments and surroundings. It has been a big fight from the first, and those favoring it have met with opposition from various interested sources, and have encountered obstacles which less courageous men would have counted insurmountable. With the first day of the present month the State care system enters upon its complete accomplishment. In this great movement the State Commissioners in Lunacy have been the leaders and of them the active, energetic, executive head has been Goodwin Brown, the legal member of that board. He has planned and supervised most of the legislation; and been its most earnest and best informed advocate wherever its policies were questioned or its advantages denied. By hard and persistent fighting, convinced that his position was right, he has at length succeeded in bringing under central control and under one great system, the asylums for the insane of the State providing for the proper care and maintenance of nearly ten thousand afflicted. While others have done a share of the work, its heaviest burdens and greatest responsibilities have fallen upon Mr. Brown, and the ability he has shown in carrying on and managing the thousand and one details of an immense undertaking is both remarkable and worthy of commendation. He has shown rare executive talents, with an earnestness and sincerity of purpose seldom equaled. Now that the system is fairly inaugurated, his friends may pause to congratulate him, though his work is far from finished. He and his associates, Dr. MacDonald and Hon. Henry Reeves, have inaugurated and brought to this point a great undertaking, and there is every reason to believe that the same executive ability, so valuable thus far, will manage the myriad details of State care for the insane so that not only the interests of the patients will be served and advanced, but that the cost to the tax-paying public will be materially reduced. While all who helped are entitled to credit, the greatest share belongs to Mr. Brown, who all along has been the most active, energetic and industrious advocate of State care."

In 1891, Union college in recognition of Mr. Brown's services to the State, conferred upon him the honorary degree of A. M.

Mr. Brown is a member of the Society of Colonial Wars, of the Sons of the Revolution, of the Fort Orange Club of Albany, of the Psi Upsilon Club of New York, of the Masonic fraternity and various other orders and societies.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF GOODWIN BROWN

Dated June 6, 1904.

Goodwin Brown was born in Henderson, Jefferson county, N. Y., April 5, 1852, where his immediate ancestors settled very early in the century.

Mr. Brown traces his descent through sound Puritan lineage from the earliest period of New England history. His ancestors in the direct line on his father's side came from Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, England. They were particularly prominent in Colonial times, were very extensive landholders in Massachusetts not far from Boston, and the family was among the earliest benefactors of Harvard college. His ancestors were among the founders of Hartford, New Haven and Cambridge. None settled in New England later than 1638. One of them, John Hopkins, is said to have been a son of Stephen Hopkins, a signer of the Mayflower compact. The records show that they were all prominent in Colonial and Revolutionary periods and held conspicuous positions in military and civil life. One of them, Judge Joseph Hopkins, of Waterbury, Conn., earned the distinction of having been elected to the legislature of that State forty-four times in succession. He was also a prominent Revolutionary patriot.

Mr. Brown's education was begun at the Academy in the village of Mexico, Oswego county, N. Y., and was completed at Cornell university, where he was class essayist two successive years. In college he was a member of the Psi Upsilon and Phi Kappa Psi

Greek letter societies. In 1894 he was elected vice-president of the Albany Cornell Alumni Association. After leaving Cornell Mr. Brown engaged in business for a few years. In the fall of 1878 he removed to Buffalo. He was admitted to practice in the Supreme Court of this State in the spring of 1879, and in the United States Courts during the next year. January 1, 1883, Governor Cleveland appointed him pardon and extradition clerk in the governor's office—he being the second appointment by Mr. Cleveland as governor. Governor Hill reappointed him to the position on the beginning of his term in January, 1886, and again on the beginning of his second term in 1889. In 1889, upon the creation of the State Commission in Lunacy, Governor Hill appointed him as one of the democratic members. He was reappointed by Governor Flower in 1893 for a term of six years. The reappointment was bitterly opposed, and was delayed or hung up in the Senate for a period of three months by a senator, the president of the board of trustees of the Hudson River State Hospital which had recently been investigated by the commission and was shown to have been grossly mismanaged. The investigation resulted in the immediate retirement of the superintendent of the institution.

While in the governor's office Mr. Brown was actively engaged in the preparation of laws relating to criminals and criminal procedure. In 1887 he brought about a conference of representatives of the various States and territories for a unification and improvement of the extradition laws, rules and regulations, and was appointed by Governor Hill a delegate to represent the State of New York. Mr. Brown was secretary of the convention, and one of a committee to prepare a draft of a bill for presentation to Congress, providing for the regulation of the extradition of fugitives from justice. Mr. Brown was author of the law providing for the reduction of sentences of convicts for good behavior, which requires that in the case of a violation of the

conditions of their discharge they shall be reimprisoned for the unexpired portion of their term; for the remission of fines in criminal cases; for revising the extradition statutes of New York, and providing that no person charged with crime shall be returned to another State unless regularly extradited; providing for the subpœnaing of witnesses and for the production of books and papers in pardon cases before the governor; providing that convicts be sentenced so that their terms shall expire during warm weather when the opportunities for employment are greater; requiring that all stenographers' minutes and all legal papers in all cases shall be transcribed and printed on paper of a standard size, in order to provide for the effectual preservation of court papers and documents; providing that no person charged with a crime punishable by life imprisonment shall be convicted upon a plea of "guilty."

He was author of the following laws while a State commissioner in lunacy: Providing for the appointment of women physicians in State hospitals for the insane; providing for a general scheme of fire protection in all public institutions supported wholly or in part by the State; for the erection of outside iron stairways, in all hospitals in the State, public or private; providing for the appointment of a committee of a lunatic without the expense and delay of a jury, where the State is the petitioner; and a bill to prevent the contracting by county authorities for the care and maintenance of the poor, and providing for the erection of free public baths in cities and towns of New York, in 1892, and in 1895, of the amendment to this act which makes the erection of such baths mandatory in all cities of the first and second class—Mr. Brown being the author of the first general state legislation on the subject had in the United States; of which act the Medical Record of New York city, Dr. George F. Shrady, editor, under date of June 22, 1895, stated that one of the two great acts for which the Legis-

lature of 1895 should be entitled to credit was the act providing for the erection and maintenance of free public baths.

The first free public bath erected under this law was opened in the city of Buffalo January 1, 1897, in which a marble tablet was placed reciting Mr. Brown's services in procuring the passage of the act.

Mr. Brown's chief claim to recognition arises, however, by reason of his efforts together with his associate commissioners in behalf of the insane poor of New York. When the State Commission in Lunacy was created, there were 2,200 insane poor in the poorhouses of the State, most of them in a state of wretchedness, degradation and squalor which affords few parallels in modern history. For years the efforts of philanthropic people had been frustrated through the selfish greed of county authorities who desired to retain the patronage and profits arising from the wretched county system of caring for the insane poor. Mr. Brown and his associates made a thorough investigation of the poorhouses of the State. Their discoveries were something appalling, and the recital of the wrongs, indignities, sufferings and cruelties, nay, of positive indecencies, were such in many instances that they were unfit for publication. Their report upon this matter submitted to the Legislature of 1890, afforded such an insight into the condition of the unhappy people in whose welfare the commission had become interested that the bill recommended by them was passed by a substantial majority, although a similar measure had been repeatedly defeated in previous years, and an end was finally put to one of the greatest legalized scandals in the chief State of the Union. The act provided for the removal to State hospitals of all the insane poor in the poorhouses as soon as sufficient accommodations should be secured.

During the next year the commission recommended an appropriation of $454,000 to complete

the work of providing additional accommodations. The money was voted without dissent, and the work of providing the buildings was at once begun. These buildings were completed prior to October 1, 1893. From that period all of the insane became wards of the State, wholly supported and cared for by appropriations made by the legislature, with the exception of the insane of the counties of New York and Kings. The Legislature of 1895 provided for the care by the State of the insane of Kings county, and the Legislature of 1896, for the removal of the insane of New York county to the care of the State. Beginning with 1895, the system of special appropriations for the use of State hospitals was abolished by the legislature upon the recommendation of the commission, and a general scheme of providing for a State tax for all purposes to be disbursed under the direction of the commission was established, power being given the commission to determine the quantity and quality of supplies and the price to be paid therefor in all of the State hospitals. These reforms were not brought about, especially those relating to the management of the State hospitals for the insane, without bitter and untiring opposition on the part of the superintendents and the trustees in most instances. The commission, however, from the beginning was supported by the legislature and by each governor, so that the system established has become in all respects the leading one in the United States, if not in the world. During this period, the condition of the State hospitals was greatly improved, although the reduction in the expenditures under the management of the commission amounted to $300,000 per year, exclusive of the counties of New York and Kings. The Willard and Binghampton hospitals, which had been conducted as incurable institutions, were placed upon the curable basis and put upon the plane of the other State hospitals. This insured to all inmates the same high standard of care.

In 1894, the State Commission in Lunacy was

made a constitutional body by a vote of 122 in favor to 18 against, thus placing the care of the insane directly under the control of the commission, and excluding the State Board of Charities from voice or control in this department of the State's charities. The constitution was ratified by the people and went into effect January 1, 1895.

Mr. Brown was also active with his associates in reforming abuses in the private asylums, compelling the reorganization of all and revoking the licenses of those improperly conducted and providing for the appointment of properly educated and trained physicians, and placing all such asylums on a common standard in ability to care for their inmates.

The press from time to time commented favorably on Mr. Brown's work as a member of the commission and his work generally in behalf of the State. Under date of October 2, 1893, the Utica Press said editorially:

"There has been very much said and very much done during the last few years looking toward the establishment of what has been commonly known as the system of State care for the insane. One of its objects has been to take from the almhouses of the several counties all the unfortunates suffering from mental malady and place them in State institutions where they may have the benefit of the best medical care and treatment with proper environments and surroundings. It has been a big fight from the first, and those favoring it have met with opposition from various interested sources, and have encountered obstacles which less courageous men would have counted insurmountable. With the first day of the present month the State care system enters upon its complete accomplishment. In this great movement the State Commissioners in Lunacy have been the leaders and of them the active, energetic, executive head has been Goodwin Brown, the legal member of that board. He has planned and supervised most of the legislation; and been its

most earnest and best informed advocate wherever its policies were questioned or its advantages denied. By hard and persistent fighting, convinced that his position was right, he has at length succeeded in bringing under central control and under one great system, the asylums for the insane of the State providing for the proper care and maintenance of nearly ten thousand afflicted. While others have done a share of the work, its heaviest burdens and greatest responsibilities have fallen upon Mr. Brown, and the ability he has shown in carrying on and managing the thousand and one details of an immense undertaking is both remarkable and worthy of commendation. He has shown rare executive talents, with an earnestness and sincerity of purpose seldom equaled. Now that the system is fairly inaugurated his friends may pause to congratulate him, though his work is far from finished. He and his associates, Dr. Carlos F. MacDonald and Hon. Henry A. Reeves, have inaugurated and brought to this point a great undertaking, and there is every reason to believe that the same executive ability, so valuable thus far, will manage the myriad details of State care for the insane so that not only the interests of the patients will be served and advanced, but that the cost to the tax-paying public will be materially reduced. While all who helped are entitled to credit, the greatest share belongs to Mr. Brown, who all along has been the most active, energetic and industrious advocate of State care."

In 1899 he was a democratic candidate for reappointment as State Commissioner in Lunacy. Governor Roosevelt was petitioned by nearly all the members of his party in the State Senate to appoint Mr. Brown, and although supported by leading philanthropists, judges, college presidents and great numbers of other prominent citizens of the State, the Governor sent in the nomination of a Republican which he was compelled to withdraw by the Senate and to substitute therefor a nomination which would procure his party's approval. On re-

tiring from public life, the following resolutions were adopted by the State Commission in Lunacy, and the medical superintendents of the New York State Hospital for the Insane:

WHEREAS, After a service of ten years as a Commissioner in Lunacy of the State of New York, the Hon. Goodwin Brown has retired from the Commission and it is appropriate that the existing Commission record its esteem of his work and administration; and

WHEREAS, The present admirable design and system of the official work of this department and of the State Hospital system is in large part due to the untiring efforts of Mr. Brown while a Commissioner, and is considered, by those best fitted to judge of its worth, worthy of the highest praise; and

WHEREAS, He was a chief factor in creating that memorable chapter in the history of lunacy in New York, known as the "State Care Act"; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Brown's services to the State in this regard present an illustration of the best political economies and offer a brilliant example of humanitarianism; having been always directed to the interests of the State, and never having overlooked the safety and welfare of the insane, for which the State Care act was created; now, therefore,

Resolved, That, in the opinion of the Commission in Lunacy, on the retirement of Mr. Brown from the Commission, the State loses a valuable and conscientious servant; the insane, a persistent, benevolent and able advocate, and his former colleagues, a friend valued for his manhood, loyalty and the absolute courage of his convictions.

At a conference of the medical superintendents of New York State Hospitals, held August 1, 1899, the following resolution was unanimously adopted on the retirement of Goodwin Brown from the office of the State Commission in Lunacy:

Resolved, That in the retirement of the Hon. Goodwin Brown from the State Lunacy Commission, with which he had been identified as legal commissioner, in 1889, the State Hospital service has lost a faithful, zealous and efficient officer.

Resolved, That the medical superintendents in this conference assembled recognize the important part played by Commissioner Brown in the establishment of State care of the insane, as well as his skill and ability as an administrative officer.

Resolved, That Commissioner Brown's persistent and intelligent efforts on behalf of the dependent insane resulted in a general elevation of the standard of care throughout the State.

Resolved, That the medical superintendents are sensible of their loss in official fellowship, by reason of Commissioner Brown's retirement, and bespeak for him in private life a degree of prosperity and happiness commensurate with his conspicuous deserts.

During the period of his public service he was for several years a non-resident lecturer in the Cornell Law School.

On his retirement from the service of the State he resumed the practice of law in the City of New York, making Yonkers his place of residence. During the session of Congress of 1901 and for several following sessions he represented the State of New York in its efforts to secure legislation to more effectually exclude insane immigrants; appearing before the United States Industrial Commission and congressional committees. His work was successful in the session of 1903 when the Immigration Bill was passed, containing the restrictive provisions which he had for years labored. The president of the American Medico-Psychological Association in his address at Washington, D. C., May 12, 1903, referring to this legislation, spoke of Mr. Brown as

follows: "As *amicus curiae* it has been ex-Commissioner Brown's privilege to render our entire country a high order of public service in the role of catholic publicist, by giving effective testimony on this subject at repeated hearings before the Industrial Commission of Congress."

In 1902, at the request of the Yonkers School Board, he addressed to it a communication on behalf of baths in the public schools which was soon followed by their installation.

In 1904 he was appointed a democratic member of the Yonkers Board of Health and was elected President of the Board, although a minority member. Mr. Brown in 1904 was the author of the State Legislation for the appointment of State Board of Lunacy Examiners to work in conjunction with the United States Government for the exclusion of insane immigrants.

In 1891, Union college in recognition of Mr. Brown's services to the State, conferred upon him the honorary degree of A. M.

Mr. Brown was a member of the Society of Colonial Wars, of the Sons of the Revolution, of the Psi Upsilon Club of New York, of the Masonic fraternity and various other orders and societies.

Form 819 14-3-98-300

STATE OF NEW YORK—STATE COMMISSION IN LUNACY

Reprint from *Rochester Post Express*. November 23, 1897. Revised by Commissioner GOODWIN BROWN.

STATE CARE OF THE INSANE.

INTERESTING INFORMATION FURNISHED TO SENATOR PARSONS, AND BY HIM TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

What it Costs Per Week to Maintain the Insane Wards of the State---They Receive Better Care Than Anywhere Else in the World.

Through the efforts of Senator Cornelius R. Parsons, of this city, the taxpayers of Monroe County will have an opportunity to learn in condensed form just what it costs the State to care for its insane wards in the State hospitals and the great advantage in the present system as compared with the old method of having each County care for its own insane patients.

At this morning's session of the Board of Supervisors the following correspondence was read by Clerk Bastable and the supervisors ordered it printed in the official proceedings.

"ROCHESTER, N. Y., Nov. 23, 1897.

"Mr. JAMES H. REDMAN, Chairman, and Members of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Monroe:

"*Gentlemen*:—When in Albany a few days ago, in conversation with Mr. Goodwin Brown, State Commissioner in Lunacy, he told me so many things of interest concerning the care and treatment of the insane and the expense thereof, that I asked him to embody in a letter what he had said to me, with such other thoughts as might occur to him, all of which I felt would be appreciated by the people of our County. This he has done, and I herewith transmit the same. I think you will find the communication of Mr. Brown of great interest, and in view of the fact that one of the State hospitals is located in Monroe County, have concluded that the information which Mr. Brown furnishes should be given our citizens, and shall be glad to have it reach them through the medium of your board.

Very truly yours,

CORNELIUS R. PARSONS.

"STATE OF NEW YORK—STATE COMMISSION IN LUNACY.

"ALBANY, Nov. 10, 1897.

"*Dear Sir*:—In response to your inquiry relative to the average cost of the care and treatment of the insane in the New York State hospitals, I have the honor to say:

"For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1896—the results for the past year have not yet been compiled—the average cost for maintenance or ordinary expenses for each patient was $186.68 per year, or $3.58 per week. Of course, in some hospitals the rate is higher, and in some lower. For example, Rochester, having a small population, it naturally follows that the rate would be somewhat above the amount stated. This cost of maintenance is divided as follows: Medical services and officers' salaries generally, $.22 per week, or $11.44 per year; wages of nurses and attendants and general employees, $1.23 per week, or $63.96 per year; food supplies, laundry supplies, crockery, general kitchen supplies, tableware, etc., $1.20 per week, or $62.40 per year; ordinary repairs to buildings and furniture, $.08 per week, or $4.16 per year; care and maintenance of the farm and grounds, $.08 per week, or $4.16 per year; patients' clothing of all kinds, $.21 per week, or $10.92 per year; renewals of furniture and bedding, $.06 per week, or $3.12 per year; books and stationery, $.03 per week, or $1.56 per year; fuel and light, $.27 per week, or $14.04 per year; medicines and medical supplies, $.04 per week, or $2.08 per year; other items of maintenance, which can not be classified, $.09 per week, or $4.68 per year; cost of conveying patients from homes to hospitals, $.02 per week, or $1.25 per year.

"I think there has been some misapprehension in the minds of the public in regard to this charge for what is commonly called maintenance. It is often confused by those unfamiliar with the subject with food supplies or ordinary board. Consequently some have believed that $3.58 per week was excessively high, considering that the ordinary variety of table board can be obtained from $3.50 to $4 per week. Nothing could be farther from the truth as the above statement shows.

"It may be interesting to analyze these items to some extent. Nearly all of the first item, namely, medical service, is for the salaries of physicians. It must be borne in mind that primarily all of the insane are sick people, or at least those suffering from ill health, as it goes without saying that no insane person can physically be entirely well, consequently they require a great deal of medical service. Moreover this medical service is of a special order. Physicians in the hospital service are required to pass a special examination to show their

qualifications for the treatment of mental diseases, as well as to show their qualifications for the care of the sick generally. There are at the present time 106 medical officers in the whole State service, or an average of about one physician to each 187 patients. When one bears in mind how much care and attention the insane require, the number of physicians employed, I think you will agree, is not excessive. Of course, at Rochester the proportion is very much greater as a certain number of physicians are required to properly organize a hospital, no matter how small.

"The next item of considerable expenditure is that of wages for nurses and attendants and general employees, $1.23 per week, or $63.96 per year. There is an average of one attendant or nurse to each eight or nine patients. This is necessary as physical restraint is no longer used in the care and treatment of the insane. In the old days patients were cared for by being placed in restraint; many of them wearing camisoles, muffs, others being strapped to chairs, others being constantly confined in rooms, and great numbers being practically kept in seclusion or in airing courts. The improved condition of the insane to-day is largely due to the fact that more nurses and attendants are employed. This means not only that there is less danger of violence on the part of patients toward each other, but also on the part of patients against attendants, or attendants against patients. Moreover the additional nursing which can be obtained conduces greatly to their recovery. While the insane, under medical and other supervision, are capable of doing much work, they are not capable of performing very much skilled labor, and the consequence is that a larger number of employees is required to care for this class than for any other class of public institutions, and therefore the mistake should not be made of comparing the number of employees in hospitals for the insane with that of institutions where other classes of the State's dependents are cared for, as all these other classes are composed of sane people.

"In regard to the food supplies, crockery, kitchen ware, knives and forks, laundry supplies, etc., the item of $1.20 per week or $62.40 per year is believed to be low. The diet is, as far as practicable, the same throughout the State, it being intended that each hospital shall be allowed substantially similar supplies. While nothing extravagant in the way of food supplies is permitted, the diet obviously has to be of such a character as will tend to produce the best curative results. The dietary at present in use was prepared by Dr. Austin Flint, of New York, said to be one of the most distinguished physiologists in this country, or perhaps in the world. Moreover, a large number of the insane obviously require special diet, for example, those who are sick in bed, and those having peculiar types of disease also require a different class of food supplies than those ordinarily allowed. When you stop to consider that sheriffs throughout the State charge for the board of jail prisoners from $2.75 to $4 per week, for coarse meat and vegetables, I think you will agree with me that this rate is a very low one. Certainly it is not believed that people generally outside of institutions obtain for $1.20 per week what the State is able to furnish for this sum.

"Without going through all the items, most of the other items furnished are obvious and require no explanation, with possibly the exception of clothing. A very small percentage of the whole 21,000 patients are provided with clothing by their friends. The amount expended, when you consider that it includes hats, caps, boots, shoes, under and outer clothing, for both men and women, will be seen to be a small item, less than $11.00 per year, or $.21 per week.

"There is one other item, namely, the conveyance of patients from homes to hospitals, which was formerly a charge to the counties. This expense is now borne by the State. The whole amount expended for this purpose last year was about $18,000. The general expense throughout the State when the old county system prevailed has been estimated as high as $50,000 to $75,000 a year, for mileage and fees were charged for the bringing of patients from their homes to the hospitals.

"The average rate of maintenance previous to 1893, before items of expenditure were required to be submitted to the commission for allowance in advance, was over $216, for each patient. The first year under the new system a reduction of $31.00 per patient was made, or for the number of patients cared for by the State at that time, a saving was effected of nearly $300,000; and bear in mind that this included only one-half the State.

"While the greatest economy is exercised in all departments of the hospital service, it is believed that the insane in the State of New York are better cared for than in any State in the Union—in fact, than in any country in the world. The results in all ways are better. You have only to consider how little complaint is now made against institutions for the insane to see how true this is. Formerly it was a matter of almost weekly occurrence that attacks were made in different parts of the State against institutions for the insane.

"Your own knowledge of the management of the Rochester State Hospital will bear out what I say.

"Insanity is a disease so widespread, and affects so many people in the community, that it is not strange that public interest is always on the alert. During the past few years there has been an average of one insane person to each 314 of the population. It is a disease which is no respecter of persons; it affects all classes alike. There is one popular misconception, however, which I think it worth while to speak of, namely, that the insane with few exceptions belong to the pauper class. They represent, as a rule, families who are self-supporting and self-respecting. When a member of a family is stricken with insanity, he cannot be cared for by relatives or friends. He must be taken to a State hospital or a private institution, and the rate charged by the State, low as it is, is beyond the means of most families. While it may be possible—in fact, it is altogether likely—that the rate of maintenance may be somewhat reduced by reason of certain economies which can be effected through a careful study of the system, it would be obviously unwise to lower the rate materially from what it now is, if the State expects to get any recoveries. At the present time about 1,000 persons are discharged from the State hos-

pitals each year as recovered. More than half as many are discharged as improved. These people go back into the community and resume their ordinary avocations. The average duration of the life of an insane person after commitment to an institution is twelve years. To show the value to the State of recovering as many cases as possible, it is only necessary to show what it would cost for that period of time for maintenance. At the present rate this would amount to $2,232 for each person. The cost of buildings as fixed by the legislature amounts to $550 for each patient. This brings the total up to $2,782. According to Horace Mann and Dr. Alexander H. Stephens, the life of each individual has a financial value of $150 per year. If this be multiplied by twelve years, $1,800 more must be added as the loss to the State from this source and to this must be added interest on the whole sum at three per cent, amounting to $1,721.52, or a total for each person, on the average for the whole period, of $6,503.52.

"The care of the insane is not at all a charitable matter. It is of the highest financial value to the State to restore as many as possible to the community. A standard of care could be adopted which would not permit of half the number being discharged which are now discharged as recovered or improved or, to put it in another way, at present there are more than 1,500 discharged, recovered or improved each year. Assuming that the care and treatment were so reduced that only 1,000 would be discharged as recovered or improved, there would be a loss ultimately to the State on the remaining 500 of $3,251,760.00 for the period of twelve years for maintenance and buildings and each year there would be a similar reduction of the number of recoveries for a period of twelve years. This is not at all an exaggerated or fanciful statement. While all will concede that economy in public expenditures should everywhere prevail, no one will doubt that a penny wise and pound foolish policy should not be adopted.

"This brings me to say a word about taxation on account of the insane. Formerly under the mixed county and State system it was difficult to know what the cost of the care of the insane was. In 1890, when the State care act took effect there were, in round numbers, 8,000 patients outside the counties of New York and Kings. Three thousand of these patients were in curative institutions, 3,000 were in chronic or non-curative institutions, 2,000 were in the poor houses. In other words, out of 8,000, 5,000 were practically denied the opportunities of recovery, and only a little reflection will show what an appalling loss this would have ultimately brought on the State. The tax at the present time is one and one-tenth mills on all the taxable property of the State. It raises a large sum, but out of this sum is paid not only the maintenance of the insane, but all the expenses for buildings, repairs and improvements, and the maintenance of a scientific institute for the study of insanity. Those who do not understand the system of taxation would be surprised to learn that a farm assessed at $2,000 would be required to pay only $2.20 each year for the support of the insane. In other words, it is $1.10 per thousand. The State and county taxes being mixed, as is now the case, and the State tax being included in the county tax, no one has an opportunity of knowing what the State tax is, but a little investigation will show that it is an infinitesimal portion of the county tax.

"The old system of special appropriations for buildings, repairs and improvements has been abolished. For the five years preceding 1895 the legislature appropriated annually over $1,000,000 for the State hospitals outside of New York and Kings, which included one-half of the State. The sum now available for this purpose is less than $1,000,000 per year after the maintenance and other expenses are paid, or only one-half the sum which was formerly allowed. In other words, if the old system of special appropriations for buildings, repairs and improvements were now in effect, the State would be called upon to expend $2,800,000 a year for this purpose where now $1,000,000 only is available.

"To particularize a little more in regard to the advantages of State care, it may be pointed out that the Rochester State Hospital, formerly known as the Monroe County Asylum, had a recovery rate of only 10½ per cent based on the number admitted in the year 1890—the year before it was incorporated as a State hospital; the following year, 1891, the rate had risen to 18 per cent; in 1892, it was 17 per cent; in 1893, it was 18 per cent; in 1894, it was 25 per cent; in 1895, it was 15 per cent; in 1896, it was 23 per cent; in 1897, it was 18 per cent. The average for the years 1891–1897, inclusive, seven years, was a fraction over 19 per cent—the average rate of recovery being nearly double what the rate was the year before the State assumed control and put the institution on a proper hospital basis. To understand how great this difference is, it is only necessary to point out that a difference of 10 per cent applied to the whole State hospital system on the number of admissions each year—the number reaching nearly 6,000—would amount to the recovery and discharge of 600 additional patients each year. Obviously this gain cannot be as great throughout the State hospital system, as all of the State hospitals, with the exception of Willard and Binghamton, were on a curative basis prior to the State care act. It does mean, however, that the institutions in the counties of New York, Kings and Monroe and the great chronic institutions of Willard and Binghamton will obviously now that they are all on a curative basis, have a largely increased recovery rate.

"You will pardon me for going into so much detail in this matter, but knowing your interest in the subject, I could not refrain from presenting facts and figures which I believe will be of great interest to you.

Believe me, I am, very sincerely yours,

GOODWIN BROWN.

"HON. CORNELIUS R. PARSONS,
Rochester, N. Y."

HUGH HASTINGS, of New York, reappointed State Historian.

NO CHARGE AGAINST BROWN.

The greatest interest attached to the appointment of William Van Amee, to succeed Goodwin Brown as Lunacy Commissioner. Mr. Brown had expected to succeed himself. He is a gold democrat and has been a Lunacy Commissioner since 1889. Governor Roosevelt told Mr. Brown he had been an admirable public officer and that his recommendations were stronger than those of any man who had been before him for appointment.

Governor Roosevelt told Mr. Brown that no charges had been filed against him, although Mr. Brown has repeatedly asked him to give him an opportunity to defend himself. It is a fact that Mr. Brown has steadily refused to vote for the dismissal of T. E. McGarr, a democrat, who is secretary of the commission. He was told within two weeks that if he would vote for the dismissal of Mr. McGarr there would be no trouble about his reappointment. The charge has also been made that Mr. Brown interfered in politics in Long Island. This has proved to be utterly false.

Complaints have been made by republican contractors that Mr. Brown has not discriminated in their favor. This is probably the chief motive for the opposition to the retiring Commissioner, and also explains where the republican machine is reaching out for the patronage of the Lunacy Board with which to strengthen its fences. The commission has been kept out of politics until this time. It spends $5,000,000 a year. It controls 150 officers, 143 other employes and 21,000 insane persons.

PUTS RESPONSIBILITY ON SENATE.

Governor Roosevelt said to-day that he had decided to appoint Mr. Van Amee, because he had been told that the republican Senators would not confirm anybody except Mr. Brown. He wanted the Senate to take the responsibility. I am convinced that Mr. Van Amee will probably fail of confirmation.

William Van Amee was appointed by the Governor as a democrat. He hails from Middletown and New York city, and was recommended by Judges Parker, Cullen and Kehoe and by Abram S. Hewitt and Elihu Root. The appointment is made, however, at the request of Mr. Platt and Mr. Odell. Mr. Van Amee was an anti-snapper in 1892; he deserted the Clevelandites in 1893, and was the man who placed Judge Isaac H. Maynard in nomination for the office of Judge of the Court of Appeals at Saratoga in October of that year. Among other things Mr. Van Amee, unmindful of the storm of indignation that was to arise from the Bench and Bar of the State, said, in speaking of Judge Maynard:—

"Peculiarly fitted by nature and by training for the work to which he is now wedded, that work speaks for itself and for him, commanding, as it has commanded, the approbation of not only his official associates but of the entire profession. I know that you will esteem it a privilege to present as your candidate for this high office to the deliberate, enlightened, conscientious judgment of the people of the State that fearless citizen, that faithful officer, that spotless gentleman, that upright Judge, Isaac H. Maynard."

Judge Maynard was beaten by about 100,000 votes.

It is said of Mr. Van Amee's politics now that he is a republican in Orange county and a gold democrat in New York. In the campaign of 1896 he left the democratic party, saying he repudiated it and all its works.

WHY O'LEARY WAS DROPPED.

(By Special Wire to The Courier.)

Albany, N. Y., April 3.—Gov. Roosevelt's nominations for important state offices tonight excited great interest in the Legislature, because they disclosed an apparent intention on his part to give some big offices to the machine element of the Republican party.

The greatest bit of patronage was appropriately awarded by the Governor to Benjamin B. Odell, Jr., chairman of the Republican State Committee.

He was permitted to name William VanAmee of Newburg as a member of the State Commission in Lunacy, in place of Goodwin Brown of Buffalo.

The State Commission in Lunacy employs 160 officers, 4,500 employes, cares for 21,000 insane persons and expends $5,000,000 annually.

Two years ago the Republican politicians thought they had made a good start toward capturing the control of the $5,000,000 when they secured a place in the Commission in Lunacy for William L. Parkhurst of Canandaigua.

This nomination was suggested by John Raines, but it must be said Parkhurst has acted well. Anyhow, Goodwin Brown and Dr. Peter M. Wise, the other members of the commission, have kept it out of politics.

The nomination of William Van Amee as Brown's successor at the suggestion of Odell palpably is another grab for the patronage of the commission. Van Amee in 1893 was a Democrat and as such went to the Democratic state convention and made the speech nominating Isaac H. Maynard for Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals. Then in 1896 he supported McKinley for president and thus joined the Republican party.

Grady Will Oppose.

Gov. Roosevelt stated this afternoon that Van Amee is a gold Democrat, but Senator Goodsell who lives in Van Amee's Senate district said tonight "Van Amee is a Republican."

Senator Grady informed The Courier correspondent tonight that he should oppose the confirmation of Van Amee whom he regarded as a bogus Democrat. On the other hand some Republican Senators are reported to oppose to his confirmation because he nominated Maynard. One Republican Senator of prominence predicted tonight the rejection of this nomination. There promises to be a hot fight over it.

The Lunacy Commission.

Custom and propriety have alike prescribed that the lunacy commission should have nothing to do with partisan politics. Mr. Goodwin Brown is a Democrat in politics, but we defy anybody to point to a matter in which his party relations have in any wise influenced or shaped his performance of his official duties. His record has been, so far as we know, absolutely stainless in this regard; certain it is that his reappointment is desired by many Republicans, as well as by many Democrats.

It is said that Mr. Brown has been re-

peatedly assured that there would be no difficulty about his reappointment, provided he would agree to the removal from office of the very capable and efficient secretary of the commission, Mr. McGarr, whose place, it appears, is wanted for a Republican. We have not heard Governor Roosevelt's name used as having made any such statements as this; but if the Governor does not know that such statements have been made, it is time that he did know it, and he should exert his power and influence to protect a faithful public official, holding a non-political place, from punishment for purely partisan reasons.

The nominee to succeed Mr. Brown, Mr. Van Namee of Newburgh, used to be a Democrat, but we understand that in 1896 he formally and publicly severed all connection with the Democratic party. Undoubtedly he voted for Governor Roosevelt last fall. It is not fair to parade his appointment as that of a Democrat. Coming from the home of the chairman of the Republican State committee, as he does, it is fair to presume that Mr. Odell can secure Van Namee's vote to turn Secretary McGarr out of office—for none but petty partisan reasons.

The Argus sincerely hopes that, upon reconsideration, Governor Roosevelt may be induced to withdraw this nomination, and not assist in a raid by machine politicians upon the lunacy commission; or if not, that there is sufficient virtue in the Senate to defeat the confirmation of Mr. Van Namee, and retain Commissioner Brown in the office whose duties he has so long and so well discharged in the public interests.

OFF ON VAN AMEE

Roosevelt Withdraws Lunacy Commissioner.

WEAKENED UNDER FIRE

Governor in Fierce Mood at Ellsworth, Stranahan, Raines and Others.

(By Special Wire to The Courier.)

Albany, April 6.—Gov. Roosevelt was in a very fiery mood today and betrayed remarkable excitement.

Withdrew Van Amee.

The Governor tonight withdrew the nomination of William Van Amee for commissioner of the lunacy commission, because as he said Van Amee requested it.

Benjamin B. Odell, Jr., the chairman of the Republican State committee says he requested it.

Gov. Roosevelt no doubt feels incensed that Odell persuaded him to nominate Van Amee as a Democrat when according to a letter he wrote last fall he is a Republican.

The Governor announced on Monday that in proposing to succeed Goodwin Brown of Buffalo as a commissioner of lunacy, he was merely putting one Gold Democrat in place of another. Now he has to retire Van Amee "under fire."

NEW-YORK DAILY TRIBUNE.

TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 1899.

WAS MAYNARD'S SPONSOR.

WILLIAM VAN AMEE NOMINATED FOR LUNACY COMMISSIONER.

AN INCIDENT IN HIS CAREER WHICH MAY CAUSE HIS REJECTION BY THE SENATE AT ALBANY.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

Albany, April 3.—Governor Roosevelt made a large number of nominations for State offices tonight. Several changes of much importance will be made if the Senate assents to what the Governor has done.

Chief among these is the proposal of the Governor to substitute William Van Amee, of Newburg, as a member of the State Lunacy Commission, for Goodwin Brown, of Buffalo, who has been a member of the Commission since its organization in 1889. The Commission has enormous powers. Its three members at present—Dr. Peter M. Wise, Goodwin Brown and William L. Parkhurst—have under their control 160 officers and 4,300 employes, who care for 21,000 insane persons, and they spend $5,000,000 annually. Up to this time the Commission has been kept out of the hands of politicians, although the appointment of Mr. Parkhurst in 1897, at the suggestion of Senator Raines, caused apprehension, which, however, has not yet been justified.

MR. BROWN'S INDORSEMENTS.

Mr. Brown has become an expert in the care of the insane. The Governor stated to-day that a great many requests were made to him for Mr. Brown's reappointment and a great many protests were made against it. Among those who wrote to the Governor in favor of Mr. Brown's reappointment were ex-Governor Flower, ex-Speaker O'Grady, ex-Attorney-General Hancock, ex-Senator Sherman S. Rogers, Dr. Carlos F. MacDonald, former president of the Lunacy Commission; Ashley W. Cole, Railroad Commissioner; ex-Speaker George B. Sloan, Judges Chester, Wright and Smith, of the Su-

preme Court; Judge Alfred C. Coxe, of the United States District Court; Alexander E. Orr and President Schurman of Cornell University. Among those who favored William Van Amee were ex-Mayor Abram S. Hewitt, of New-York; Alton B. Parker, Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals; Judge Cullen, of the Supreme Court, and Elihu Root.

Both Mr. Brown and Mr. Van Amee, the Governor understood, were Gold Democrats. He was not required by law to select a Democrat, but he had decided to do so. Dr. Wise and Mr. Parkhurst are Republicans.

The Governor said that he had been in a great deal of doubt what to do in regard to this appointment. He had held a conference with Mr. Van Amee, had told him of his coming appointment, and said to him that he must keep politics out of the State hospitals for the insane.

Mr. Van Amee is a lawyer living in Newburg. It is believed that his appointment was first suggested to the Governor by Benjamin B. Odell, jr., chairman of the Republican State Committee, who lives in Newburg. Mr. Van Amee several years ago was a member of the Board of Trustees of the Middletown Homœopathic State Hospital.

THE MAYNARD EPISODE.

His political career has been a notable one in one respect. He attended the Democratic State Convention of 1893 and made the speech nominating Isaac H. Maynard for Judge of the Court of Appeals. The Tribune's dispatch from the convention, printed on October 7, 1893, said:

And now comes an event to which all were looking forward. It was introduced by Mr. William Van Amee. Mr. Van Amee was not elected as a delegate to this convention. He is a lawyer and is said to be a member of the New-York City Bar Association and of the Reform Club, and he was selected to nominate Maynard, admittedly because of his connection with these associations.

Mr. Van Amee was introduced as a delegate from Delaware County. Undoubtedly he acted as a substitute for some delegate. Below are extracts from his speech nominating Maynard:

I take pride and satisfaction in presenting for the position of Associate Judge of the Court of Appeals the name of one whose eminent fitness and qualifications have already been demonstrated by honorable service upon the bench —the name of Isaac H. Maynard. It is a name of one whose fitness and ability have been attested in every department of the public service, and acknowledged by every leader of public thought both in the State and in the Nation. Appointed and reappointed to the court which he adorns by his character, which he informs by his learning, which he invigorates by his industry, upon the earnest petition of his official associates, to whom he has endeared himself by the graces of that character, by the richness of that learning, by the fitness of that industry, peculiarly fitted by nature and by training for the work to which he is now wedded, that work speaks for itself and for him, commanding, as it has commanded, the approbation not only of his official associates, but of the entire profession. You do not need to be persuaded that such a life is worthy the highest honors which it is in the power of this convention to bestow.

And they will be bestowed. Yes, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the convention, I know that you will esteem it a privilege to present as your candidate for this high office to the deliberate, the enlightened, the conscientious judgment of the good people of this State that faithful officer, that spotless gentleman, that upright Judge, Isaac H. Maynard.

It was rumored to-night that some of the Republican Senators would oppose Mr. Van Amee's confirmation because of his speech nominating Maynard.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1899.

MAYNARDISM ONCE MORE.

The Governor's motive in the selection of a State Commissioner in Lunacy is perfectly plain and perfectly creditable to himself. He is trying his best to achieve practical good government, and he realizes that he can do this only through the co-operation of other men. With a thorough determination to let no consideration of expediency move him to do anything wrong he combines a proper disposition to conciliate the leaders of his party organization. In matters in which no sacrifice of public interest seems to be involved he may even be disposed to do things not at all pleasing to himself for the sake of obtaining support for features of his policy which he regards as more important for the good of the State. That is practical statesmanship which uses the instruments at command to accomplish something, instead of waiting for better instruments and doing nothing.

Governor Roosevelt's disposition to meet the wishes of the organization in non-essentials is commendable, but the organization seems to have led him into a serious mistake with regard to the nomination of the Commissioner in Lunacy. Mr. Van Amee is evidently the personal selection of Mr. Odell. It is impossible to explain him in any other way. He comes from Newburg, and it is not to be supposed that in the selection from all the Democrats in the State of a man to fill this important office the Governor would go into Mr. Odell's own town except at Mr. Odell's own request. The reappointment of the present Commissioner, Goodwin Brown, was urged by some of the most respectable and disinterested workers for the insane, and it was generally believed that the Governor was favorably impressed with his claims to reappointment. These claims were founded on his long and excellent service. To him more than to any other man is due the present excellent condition of our State care system. He was one of its founders, had administered it from the beginning and had saved the State thousands of dollars by his energy, honesty and business ability. Against him were arrayed some enemies. Those who were not simply desirous of the office or anxious to displace him from some other selfish motive were opposed to him not on principle, but because he had offended them by a manner admittedly brusque and untactful. But Governor Roosevelt was the last man in the world to punish a good official for rough-rider qualities, even though they were fairly the subject for criticism, and certainly he was not the man to yield to mere selfish clamor in behalf of would-be successors. Nevertheless the Governor has at the last seen fit to supersede Mr. Brown. Doubtless the reasons for this action have seemed to him of the weightiest character to lead him to take a course which could not have been sympathetic to him.

But whatever considerations urged Mr. Brown's retirement, it is apparent that in the selection of his successor Governor Roosevelt must have been misled. It is not possible that a Governor who stands for reform and a pure ballot, who is deeply concerned for honest elections in this city, should knowingly place in an impor-

tant State office a public advocate of Isaac H. Maynard. Mr. Van Amee is doubtless a man of excellent personal character, but there must be something radically wrong in his ideas of political life and public obligation. After Maynard had stolen the State Senate, after his crime was well known, after his conduct had been investigated and condemned by the Bar Association, Mr. Van Amee became the chosen spokesman of those seeking to reward him for this theft with a seat on the bench of the Court of Appeals. Three times have the people of New-York recorded their detestation of that crime. Once Maynard himself appealed to their suffrage and was sent into obscurity. Then David B. Hill, Maynard's master, dared to ask a public verdict on his part in the transaction, and was overwhelmingly defeated. Last fall, trusting to the short memories of voters, Elliot Danforth, Maynard's associate, ran for Lieutenant-Governor, and the same vote that put Governor Roosevelt in office told Danforth that election thieves were not again to be trusted with political power. It is rather late in the day for the Republican party to begin pushing the political fortunes of Maynard's spokesman in the Convention of 1893. Mr. Odell and Mr. Root have a record against Maynardism which does not harmonize with the advocacy of such an appointment.

It is not at all likely that the Governor understood this man's relation to Maynardism. Perhaps Mr. Odell himself did not. He may have been regarded merely as a pleasant neighbor and a Democratic politician, and recommended as a proper person for an office to be filled by a Democrat, with no thought of his close relation to Maynard. But now that Mr. Van Amee's record is known the mistake should be corrected by withdrawing his name from the Senate. The man who could see nothing in Maynard's theft of a Senate seat incompatible with the doings of a faithful public officer should not be placed at the head of one of the greatest departments of the State government. The Republican party, after having for years denounced Maynardism, cannot afford to stultify itself and say that those campaigns were campaigns of pretence, not of principle, and show that at its political convenience the Republican party itself is ready to adopt the view that the crime of Maynard was not much of a crime after all. Whatever reasons exist for the retirement of Mr. Brown, certainly stronger reasons exist against the substitution of Mr. Van Amee.

BROWN'S FRIENDS IN ARMS.

HOSTILITY TO THE CONFIRMATION OF MAYNARD'S SPONSOR.

THE GOVERNOR'S REASONS FOR SUPERSEDING MR. BROWN AND SOME PERTINENT REPLIES TO THEM.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

Albany, April 4.—There was considerable talk to-day among Republican Senators over Governor Roosevelt's nominations for State offices, and rumors that some of the men, notably William Van Amee, nominated for member of the State Commission in Lunacy, might not be confirmed. Yet the Senators mentioned as opponents of Mr. Van Amee's confirmation are not those who have been concerned in previous bolts. Thus, Senator Coggeshall is pleased with the nomination of John Williams, of Utica, for State Factory Inspector, and probably will support the rest of the men nominated for office by the Governor. Senator Malby, also, is pleased with the nomination of his friend, ex-Judge John M. Kellogg, of St. Lawrence County, for Judge of the Court of Claims, and, it is believed, will support the other nominations. Senator Willis secured the office of State Tax Commissioner for his friend George E. Priest, of "The Ithaca Journal," and so is likely to vote for all of the Governor's selections.

The fact was disclosed to-day that William Van Amee, the nominee for Commissioner in Lunacy, and Judge Isaac H. Maynard, were members of a social club in the Catskill Mountains. There Mr. Van Amee grew to admire the Judge, and when the latter was accused of stealing the Dutchess County election returns Van Amee defended him. Later, as related in The Tribune of to-day, he went to the Democratic State Convention of 1893 and nominated Maynard for Associate Judge of the Court of Appeals. In 1896 Mr. Van Amee is reported to have voted for McKinley for President. The Governor considers him a Gold Democrat.

ECONOMY A MOTIVE.

It is understood on high authority that the Governor hopes by putting Mr. Van Amee in the Commission in Lunacy to decrease its expenditures, and that this was his chief reason for not reappointing Mr. Brown. The expenditures of the Department now reach $5,000,000 annually. The Governor has been informed by Controller Morgan that, in his judgment, the expenditures can be reduced largely. Ex-Controller James A. Roberts also informed the Governor that the expenditures of the Commission could and should be reduced. But Mr. Brown was exhibiting a letter from Mr. Roberts to-night, in which the latter asked Governor Roosevelt to reappoint him. In this letter Mr. Roberts said:

> I have known Mr. Brown for many years, first as a lawyer in Buffalo, then as pardon clerk appointed by Governor Cleveland, and latterly as a member of the Lunacy Commission. I believe him to be honest, painstaking, intelligent and an excellent public official. Should you determine to pursue the policy of continuing the Board in its quasi non-partisan character, I do not think you could do better than retain the experience and ability of Mr. Brown.

Mr. Roberts thus favored the retention of Mr. Brown, although thinking there should be a reduction in the expenditures of the Department. Possibly the Controller thought that the State Commission in Lunacy was spending too much money on buildings and improvements to the State hospitals for the insane. The present Appropriation bill contains an item of $1,205,000 for buildings, repairs and improvements, all to be expended by the Commission in Lunacy.

CHEAPER THAN IT USED TO BE.

Mr. Brown said to-night that he did not see how the Commission could be reproached for extravagance in the maintenance of the indigent insane, as in 1893 the average cost of maintaining each inmate of the asylums was $222, whereas now it is only $185. Mr. Brown also made the point that if the expenditures of the Commission were to be curtailed, it was singular that the Appropriation bill contained the usual sum of $5,000,000 for the care of the indigent insane.

One of the reasons why the Governor declined to reappoint Mr. Brown, it is said, was that he

did not oppose the appointment of special counsel for the various State hospitals for the insane in 1897, when Speaker O'Grady and other Republican members of the Legislature got such employment. Mr. Brown said on this point:

"My advice was asked about the appointment of counsel to the insane asylums, and I said that the Commission in Lunacy would not recommend it directly or indirectly—that this was a matter which the Legislature should decide. If, however, the Legislature, which was Republican, should impose this duty on us we would be glad to get rid of the incompetent management of our cases in the Attorney-General's office."

A FEATURE OF THE OPPOSITION.

People here will watch with keen interest the action of such of the State Senators as have friends who received appointments as counsel for the State hospitals for the insane in 1897. Among these Senators, it is expected, resistance will be made to the confirmation of Mr. Van Amee. It was rumored to-night that these Senators would resist the holding of any caucus on the nomination.

It is also interesting to note that the Appropriation bill has been so artfully worded that the appropriation to pay the counsel for the asylums is continued. This appropriation also is so arranged that the Governor cannot veto it without vetoing the whole appropriation for the department. The Governor in his annual message to the Legislature criticised such extra payments for counsel, and recommended that the Attorney-General should do this work.

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1899.

THE LUNACY COMMISSIONERSHIP.

Governor Roosevelt's nomination of a State Commissioner in Lunacy involves two distinct questions. One is the propriety of superseding Commissioner Brown. The other is the fitness for the place of the man chosen to be his successor. To justify a search for a successor at all it is necessary to discover some good reason for the retirement of Mr. Brown. Without such reason all the rules of the Civil Service reformer, all the dictates of fair play, required his continuation in an office where he had done conspicuously good service and made of the gigantic experiment of State care a great administrative success and an unspeakable blessing to the insane unfortunates. The strongest considerations not of private liking but of public interest were urged upon the Governor by experts in the care of the insane. Some of Mr. Brown's most earnest supporters paid him the remarkable tribute of recommending him as the fittest man in the State for the office, in spite of what might almost be called their personal dislike, for it is no secret that Mr. Brown is not a man of popularity, and holds men's respect rather than their enthusiasm. Under such circumstances weighty reasons must have led a reform Governor to change his known intention and suddenly refuse to reappoint this excellent public servant.

The mystery of this refusal is not removed by the ostensible reasons for it. It is said that Mr. Brown spent money too lavishly. He only spent what a Republican Legislature, Governor and Controller allowed. The Lunacy Commission took charge of a number of county hospitals which had long been mismanaged and neglected, and it has been necessary to spend large sums to put them in decent order. The Commissioners who had the courage to face this emergency deserve praise rather than blame. Yet in five years the per capita cost of the hospitals has been reduced from $222 to $185, and Commissioner Brown has been most insistent in enforcing business methods and economical management upon superintendents of hospitals. If economy is desired, why are not appropriations cut down? Yet this year's bill contains the usual $5,000,000 for the insane.

Another reason for Mr. Brown's retirement is ex-Controller Roberts's complaint of the Commissioner's expenditures. But Mr. Roberts in December last wrote a long and enthusiastic letter to Governor Roosevelt asking him to retain Mr. Brown. Another allegation is that Mr. Brown favored the appointment of attorneys for the State hospitals. He denies that he invented the scheme or did more than say that if the Republican Legislature was bent on creating those offices he would do his best to get from them needed legal services that the Attorney-General's office seemed unable to give. Perhaps Mr. Brown did find it necessary to consent to this bit of patronage grabbing by the Republicans as the price of necessary appropriations for a department whose leading spirit was a Democrat. If so, is it for Republicans now to blame the helpless Democrat for being "held up"? Did the Republican members, Mr. Parkhurst and Dr. Wise, make any opposition? Or has the Republican Legislature abolished those attorneyships this year? On the contrary, it has firmly fixed the appropriation for them so that it cannot be vetoed. It ill becomes Republicans to make this scandal, of Republican origin and Republican execution, the excuse for displacing a Democrat whose office is desired for a friend and neighbor of Mr. Odell.

The fact that Mr. Odell's friend has the nomination adds peculiar significance to Mr. Brown's own explanation of his displacement:

> The real reason for my retirement is my refusal to obey Odell's orders to discharge the secretary of the Commission, Mr. McGarr, and appoint a machine man in his place. I received an intimation some time ago that if I would vote for Mr. McGarr's discharge Odell would let up on his fight against me, but I refused. This is the first time that politics has been introduced in this Commission, and politics is entirely responsible for my retirement.

That, at least, can be understood. It is not so lame as the other excuses. It fits in with our surmise of yesterday that the Governor felt obliged to keep on reasonable terms with the organization for great public ends, and the necessity of conciliating the organization may explain Governor Roosevelt's change of mind on this subject within the last week it was before him.

As to Mr. Van Amee, his confirmation would forever close the mouth of the Republican party on the greatest moral issue it has had in this State for many years. Mr. Van Amee has published a card saying he nominated Judge Maynard "to testify to his personal worth. While I "deeply regretted the incident which aroused "such fierce discussion, I felt that the duty of a "friend was to stand by a friend when he was "in trouble—not when everything was smooth "sailing." We honor Mr. Van Amee for standing by his friend. But it is one thing to stand

by a friend who has done wrong and is in trouble, to comfort him, admonish him, even shield him; and it is another thing to try to make the public reward him for a crime. A father may pity a defaulting son and pay his debts and perhaps save him from prison, but he must not try afterward to put him in somebody's bank as a trustworthy cashier. Mr. Van Amee was not merely testifying personal loyalty, but trying to reward political crime, and if he cannot now see that, his blindness is an evidence of his unfitness for official trust.

Another thing to be said about Mr. Van Amee is that he is not a Democrat. In the last campaign he published a written repudiation of that party, declaring in view of the present principles of the Democracy in this State, "I am no longer a Democrat." He supported Republicans for Congress and the Legislature, and presumably also voted for Mr. Roosevelt. In that, of course, he did right. If Governor Roosevelt wishes to make the Commission in Lunacy a strictly Republican body he has the power to do so. But if that is the intention let it be known, and let us not have the Commission called nonpartisan on the pretence that a man is a Democrat who for three years has opposed that party and says he does not belong to it. A wiser course would be to correct the mistake and save the Republican party from condoning Maynardism and preserve the non-political character of the Commission in Lunacy.

MR. VAN AMEE'S RECORD.

HIS LIBERALITY AS A TRUSTEE OF MIDDLETOWN ASYLUM.

A WINE BILL WITH WHICH GOVERNOR FLOWER FOUND FAULT—VAN AMEE'S "COUNSEL FEE" IN A LUNACY CASE.

Albany, April 5 (Special).—There were some interesting developments to-day in the case of William Van Amee, of Newburg, nominated by Governor Roosevelt to succeed Goodwin Brown as State Lunacy Commissioner. The Governor sent to the State Commission in Lunacy for documents bearing on Mr. Van Amee's record as a trustee of the Middletown State Homœopathic Asylum for the Insane. Among the papers he thus received were two letters written by Mary E. Mundy, of West New-Brighton, containing a most astonishing statement of the expenses an estate in which her husband, Nathan B. Mundy, had an interest, had to pay in consequence of his incarceration in 1887 in the Middletown asylum. This estate was that of Sarah Barrett, of Richmond, Staten Island. Mrs. Mundy states that the four weeks' incarceration of her husband cost the estate the sum of $6,880 94 in lawyers' fees, asylum fees, medical experts' fees and a "Commissioner's" fees. The asylum resisted the habeas corpus proceedings which were brought, and Governor Roosevelt's attention was called to the statement made in the accounting that William Van Amee received as "counsel" $445 25.

As bearing upon Mr. Van Amee's disposition to keep down the expenses of State institutions, some records of Governor Flower's administration were made public to-day, showing that Mr. Van Amee was a member of an Auditing Board of the Middletown asylum, but did not cut down a wine bill of the institution which amounted to $900, and that subsequently Governor Flower had most of the trusteees before him and demanded explanations regarding this bill and others.

SENATORS' INDORSEMENT OF BROWN.

The letter addressed to Governor Roosevelt by nineteen Republican Senators asking him to reappoint Goodwin Brown as Lunacy Commissioner was made public to-day. Part of it follows:

We know he has been a faithful public servant, that under the administration with which he has been connected there has been a great improvement in the management of the State institutions for the insane, that there has been a reduction in the per capita cost of maintenance, an abandonment of the extravagant methods of construction, so far as construction is controlled by the Commission, an adoption of systematic methods of administration greatly to the advantage of the State. To his work he has devoted the best years of his life with a zeal and faithfulness which merit recognition.

Though continually called upon to antagonize the ideas of individuals and boards of managers, anxious chiefly for the aggrandizement of their particular institutions, he has deserved and received their respect and confidence, and no scandal has been connected with his private or official acts. For these and other reasons we earnestly recommend his reappointment.

The following Senators signed this letter: Timothy E. Ellsworth, Nevada N. Stranahan, Nathaniel A. Elsberg, Henry S. Ambler, Hobart Krum, George R. Malby, Henry J. Coggeshall, William E. Johnson, Charles T. Willis, John Raines, William W. Armstrong, George Allen Davis, John Ford, William L. Thornton, George Chahoon, James D. Feeter, Benjamin Martin Wilcox, Franklin D. Sherwood and Cornelius R. Parsons.

One of these Senators, Mr. Thornton, had no thought that Mr. Van Amee would be nominated. Mr. Van Amee has long been a personal friend of his. It is not surprising, therefore, that he is now seeking to bring about the confirmation of Mr. Van Amee.

MR. VAN AMEE'S POLITICS.

The Governor said on Monday that he had nominated Mr. Van Amee as a member of the State Commission in Lunacy partly because he was a Gold Democrat. Goodman Brown, whom he is to succeed, is a Democrat. The Governor appears to have been misled, for Mr. Van Amee wrote a letter on October 7, 1898, in which he said he was not a Democrat. He appears to be a Republican, and was so declared to be by Senator Goodsell on Monday night.

Senator Thornton, who is warmly supporting Mr. Van Amee for confirmation, showed the letter in question to the Governor this afternoon. It is as follows:

year with the party in support of the State ticket. I notice, also, that Mr. Hornblower says that he will support that ticket because it is his duty to encourage any movement which tends to break down the heresies of the Chicago platform.

I do not so understand the situation. The Syracuse Convention led no such movement, and exerted no such influence. On the contrary, nothing was more strikingly in evidence than the popularity of Bryan and all that his name implies. Loyalty to Bryan and the Chicago platform was made the test of regularity. No candidate dared to go before the Convention whose friends did not go about pledging that he voted for Bryan. The leading candidate upon the ticket could not have been nominated if the Kings County delegation had not gone about with the now familiar but still amusing shibboleth: "He voted for Bryan."

This is entirely in harmony with the action of the party two years ago, when it drove off the ticket its nominee for Governor, because he was a Gold Democrat, though in the month of June previous its State Convention had professed adherence to the gold standard.

The omission from the Syracuse platform of an express ratification of the Chicago platform does not deceive anybody—above all, the men whose votes this omission was designed to catch. The Convention did not dissent from the Chicago platform, and not one member of it dared to propose that it should. The New-York Democracy is simply drifting with the tide of Democratic sentiment throughout the country. The proofs multiply upon every hand that the silver issue is to be pushed to the front in 1900 with the Democratic organization of New-York in full support and co-operation.

Such being the case, I am no longer a Democrat. The issues involved in this election are distinctly National in their scope, their influence and their results. The pending campaign is but preliminary to the campaign two years hence, when the questions which the Democratic party refuses to consider settled by the adverse result two years ago must be again fought out and decided.

WILLIAM VAN AMEE.

FRIDAY, APRIL 7, 1899.

FACTS WANTED.

Governor Roosevelt owes it to himself and to Commissioner Brown to make public the objections to the latter which led to the refusal to reappoint him Commissioner in Lunacy. It is a gross injustice to a man generally believed to have performed faithful public service to let it be understood that he is displaced from office because of some serious and mysterious fault. If there are any charges against him both the public and the man whose reputation is thus attacked are entitled to know them. If Mr. Brown's rejection was a mere question of politics, if it was necessary to conciliate Mr. Odell, all right. There may be reasons of public policy which demand such conciliation. The Governor has not hitherto hesitated to make openly concessions to practical politicians which less courageous reformers would have preferred to make in secret, and he has gained public respect by his straightforward honesty in so doing. He does not need to depart from that policy now, even if the result has been unfortunate and Mr. Odell's friend unexpectedly turns out to be a champion of Maynard and a man whose former dealings with the Lunacy Department have not been beyond criticism. But even if important public interests required the giving of this office to Mr. Odell, and even if Mr. Odell wished to control the place so as to bring the hospitals back into politics, it is not fair to displace Mr. Brown under the shadow of insinuations which nobody will make specific.

We do not say this from any desire to champion Mr. Brown's cause. While the question was pending we studiously refrained from taking any part for or against his reappointment. If he is the bad man his critics insinuate we want to know it and give credit to Governor Roosevelt for retiring him. We simply say that the published reasons for the action do not explain it. We have no doubt of Governor Roosevelt's good faith and good intentions. We do not even question that he had good reasons for not reappointing Mr. Brown. We realize the difficulties of his position and we dislike even to seem to criticise a man who is evidently trying to do the best he can for the State with imperfect and refractory instruments at his command. But for his own sake, for the sake of the party, his action should be explained to the public by adequate reasons, so that he may not hereafter be reproached with having dealt unjustly and in violation of reform principles with a man who so far as the public has had a chance to learn has been an excellent officer. If the charges against him are not well founded Mr. Brown should have an opportunity to refute them. And whether they are well founded or ill founded, Governor Roosevelt should give the man who rests under them the chance to know what they are.

NEW YORK TIMES,

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1899.

CLASH OVER NOMINATIONS

Selection of Van Amee and March Displeases Senators.

POSITION OF GOV. ROOSEVELT

Why He Did Not Reappoint Lunacy Commissioner Brown—Mr. Brown's Reply to Charges.

ALBANY, April 4.—Gov. Roosevelt's first clash with the Senate on a question of appointments will come, it is now expected, on the nominations of William Van Amee to be a member of the Lunacy Commission and of James E. March to be a Port Warden, which were among those sent in last night.

The friends of Goodwin Brown, for whose place on the Lunacy Commission Mr. Van Amee is named, are confidently predicting that the nomination will not be confirmed, and the Democrats, who are preparing to make a vicious fight on March, make the same prediction concerning him. In view of the closeness of the vote in the Senate, and of the divided condition of the majority, these predictions seem not without basis. The Governor, it is known, expected that a fight would be made on Mr. Van Amee, and he is not, it is said, unprepared for it. He was told that Mr. Brown, who, though a Democrat, counts on his strongest support from such Republicans as Senators Raines, Parsons, Coggeshall, and Malby, was the only man who could be confirmed as Lunacy Commissioner. Mr. Brown's reappointment being, in the Governor's view, out of the question, he sent in the name of Van Amee and placed on the Senate the responsibility of confirming or defeating the nomination.

PARTIES TO THE FIGHT.

The fight will be between the Governor, backed by the influence of Senator Platt, Chairman Odell, and the Republican organization on the one hand, and the Democrats, with such votes as Commissioner Brown can command through his personal hold on certain Republican Senators, on the other. If the nomination were of a Republican there seems to be no reason to believe that it would receive less than the party vote. With one Democrat taking the place of another it may be that as many as two members of the majority may claim the privilege of exercising their personal preference. Two Republicans voting with the Democrats would defeat the nomination.

Two contradictory objections are being urged against Mr. Van Amee. One, which the Democrats emphasize, is that he is not a Democrat. The charge is made that in 1896 he wrote a letter in which he renounced his affiliation with the Democratic Party, and that he voted for Mr. McKinley in that year, and for Gov. Roosevelt in the last campaign.

The other objection which is brought forward by Republican friends of the present Commissioner is that Mr. Van Amee is too violent a Democrat, in proof of which it is shown that he made the speech nominating Maynard for Judge of the Court of Appeals, in the course of which he highly eulogized the nominee.

In addition to the charge that Mr. Van Amee has formally renounced his Democratic allegiance, the Democrats claim that he is B. B. Odell's man, and that, being appointed at the instance of the Chairman of the Republican State Committee, he would be for all practical purposes a Republican. They assert that if the Governor means to appoint a Democrat, an efficient official ought not to be turned out to make way for a new man inexperienced in the office, who, while sailing under Democratic colors, is in reality a Republican.

VAN AMEE AND MAYNARD.

As to Mr. Van Amee having made a speech nominating Maynard, it is said by those familiar with the circumstances that he was a warm personal friend of Judge Maynard, that they were fellow-members of the Winnisook Club of Ulster County, and that his support of Maynard was more a personal and social matter than political. As Mr. Brown was also a Hill Democrat and voted for Maynard, the Governor apparently thought that he had no advantage in that respect over his proposed successor.

It is known that Gov. Roosevelt at first intended to reappoint Commissioner Brown. His decision not to do so is understood to have resulted largely from the representation made by ex-Controller Roberts concerning the extravagance in the conduct of the Lunacy Department. In his several reports Mr. Roberts directed attention to the enormous expenditure for the care of the insane and to the apparently lavish hand with which the State's money was spent, pointing out that the inmates of the asylums and the officials who care for them frequently lived in a style far beyond what most of the taxpayers who supported them could afford. The Governor, it appears was led to believe that Commissioner Brown, as the resident member of the board and its executive head, was mainly responsible for this extravagance.

Moreover, the Governor became convinced that Mr. Brown was responsible for the bill providing for the employment of a special attorney for every hospital in the State. Under this bill prominent Republican politicians like James M. E. O'Grady, Senator Malby, and Congressman Sherman were appointed to these sinecures, and the Governor, it is said, believed that he detected a scheme on Commissioner Brown's part to make himself solid with the Republican machine and insure his retention under a Republican administration.

The Governor also received complaints against Commissioner Brown from prominent workers in the charitable organizations of the State protesting against Mr. Brown's retention. He was also informed Mr. Brown had accepted fees for influencing legislation since becoming a member of the commission.

Mr. Van Amee was not, it is said, the Governor's personal choice. Had it not been that a close Senate had to be consulted, he would have named a man absolutely disconnected with politics. In Mr. Van Amee, however, he is said to have concluded that he had a man who was not only honest, highly educated, and competent, but one who would be satisfactory to the organization.

REPLY OF MR. BROWN.

In answer to the objections before mentioned, Commissioner Brown said to-night that ex-Controller Roberts could hardly have held him responsible for alleged extravagance in the department, since the ex-Controller had recommended him for reappointment, in proof of which he produced a copy of a letter addressed to Gov. Roosevelt by Mr. Roberts on Dec. 13, 1898, in which he said:

"I believe Mr. Brown to be honest, painstaking, intelligent, and an excellent public official. Should you determine to pursue the policy of continuing the board in its quasi-non-partisan character I do not think you could do better than retain the experience and ability of Mr. Brown."

Instead of being extravagant, Mr. Brown said that the commission had reduced the cost of the care of the insane from $220 a year in 1893 to $185 a year in 1898, a saving of $777,000 a year. Mr. Brown declared that neither he nor the Lunacy Commission as a whole was responsible for the creation of the special counsel; that the commission had declined to recommend the plan, though they told the Finance Committee that if the Legislature chose to enact it, the commission would accept it and be glad, because of the incompetency of the Attorney General's office.

As to the accusation of lobbying, Mr. Brown declared that he had never accepted a fee for influencing legislation but once, and that was on a bill authorizing savings banks to invest in the bonds of Springfield, Mass. He appeared then, he said, as an attorney, and at that time the members of the board were not required to give all their time to its work.

THE GOVERNOR AND THE MACHINE.

The list of nominations sent by the Governor to the Senate on Monday is in some respects a pretty good chart of the relations maintained by Mr. ROOSEVELT with the machine.

The best nomination is that of J. EDGAR LEAYCRAFT of this city to be one of the Tax Commissioners. He is an admirable man for the place, upright, intelligent, experienced in the line of his duties, energetic, and universally respected. The place, moreover, is one that should be held by a representative of New York, and Mr. LEAYCRAFT'S nomination does tardy justice to the city in the best selection that could have been made. Mr. KILBURN'S nomination for reappointment as Superintendent of Banks secures the continuance of efficient service in an important post. The selection of JOHN N. KELLOGG as Judge of the Court of Claims is praised by those who know him.

There is a dispute as to the nomination for Lunacy Commissioner, which has nothing to do with the point we have suggested, since both the present incumbent and the Governor's nominee are Democrats. But as to the rest of the names, we presume that no one will claim that they indicate a high standard of selection. They are practically the machine's nominations.

Gov. ROOSEVELT'S friends say, and probably he would himself say, that he has "done the best he could." We do not forget his previous appointments, such as those of Messrs. PARTRIDGE, ANDREWS, and HEINS. These, we take it, are the kind he would always make, if he felt free to apply his own standard. If the others, not so good, are the best he can make, the question cannot be evaded: Why cannot he make better? There are several reasons. In the first place, if it had been known in advance that he would make no appointments to suit the machine, but would apply the highest standard of fitness in all cases, he could not, probably, have been nominated, and whatever good he can now do in his office he could have had no chance to do. In the second place, had he, after election, insisted on the highest standard, he would have had immediately an open fight with the machine, and, as the machine controls the Legislature, he could have secured no confirmations of his nominations from the Senate and no legislation such as the Civil Service bill that has just passed the Senate and is sure to pass the Assembly. In other words, the poorer nominations are the price the Governor has to pay for the good ones and for the aid of the machine in getting good laws.

We think this a fair statement of the situation from the Governor's point of view. We have no special comment to make on it. It does not seem to us to require any. Whatever may be the judgment to pass on the Governor himself, the only one to pass on the situation is that it is deplorable and disgraceful, and no honest citizen is justified in "making the best" of it who is not prepared unselfishly to do all that he can to reform it.

The removal of Goodwin Brown as the Democratic member of the Lunacy Commission is criticised by both Democrats and Republicans, and is likely to provoke a warm fight in the Senate. Mr. Brown was highly indorsed for reappointment, his backers including nineteen Senators. It is openly charged by Mr. Brown's friends that he had been given to understand that if he would consent to the removal of Secretary McGarr of the commission, who is also a Democrat, he could retain his place.

The selection of Mr. Van Amee is credited to Chairman Odell of the Republican State Committee, from whose home town he comes. The Governor said that this place had caused him a great deal of trouble. There were many requests for Mr. Brown's retention, he said, and many protests against it.

MR. BROWN'S RETIREMENT.

FURTHER LIGHT ON THE VAN AMEE NOMINATION.

A Statement by Mr. Brown—Refusal by Gov. Roosevelt to Inform Him of the Objections to Him.

[Special Despatch to The Evening Post.]

ALBANY, April 6.—From the talk heard at the capitol to-day, it appears that the Governor's refusal to reappoint Goodwin Brown as Commissioner in Lunacy and his nomination of B. B. Odell's friend Mr. Van Amee, have caused more criticism than any act of his administration. Mr. Brown is regarded here as a model public official both by Democrats and Republicans, and it was believed until this week that he would be reappointed, as he appears to be just the kind of a man that the Governor, in carrying out his civil-service-reform ideas, would keep in office. As the Governor has not given out any explanation of his action, Mr. Brown was asked to-day whether he had been informed why he was not reappointed.

"The Governor informed me a few days ago," he replied, "that he could not reappoint me, and said that two Senators had come to him with charges against me. He refused to name the Senators or to tell me what the charges were; so, of course, I had no chance to defend myself. The news that I was to be 'turned down' was a surprise to me. Only a few days ago the Governor told Alexander E. Orr and Dr. Backus of the Long Island Hospital that he considered me an excellent official, and I understood that I was to be permitted to continue the work in which I have been engaged for ten years. It seems, however, that Mr. Odell was determined to get rid of me and put a friend in my place, and his influence was greater than mine.

"I wish to say here that the nineteen Republican Senators who asked for my reappointment were under no obligations whatever to me. I never did a favor for any one of them in the way of patronage since I have been in office, and they signed that petition without solicitation from me, and solely because they thought that if a Democrat was to be appointed, my record justified my selection. I had no party backing in my candidacy. I have always been a Democrat, but I never attended a convention or took part in organization work.

"A report has reached me that one reason for the Governor's action was that I was a Hill man. That is the most ridiculous of the stories told about me. Gov. Cleveland brought me from Buffalo to Albany in 1882, and I have never figured in factional politics. The other charges about my pushing through the hospital attorney's bill and appearing as an attorney before committees, I answered in the *Evening Post* yesterday. The only cause I can assign for my retirement, therefore, is the desire of the Governor to give my place to another man."

The career of Mr. Brown in Albany dates from 1882, when Gov. Cleveland appointed him pardon clerk. While in that office he prepared many important laws relating to criminals and criminal procedure. In 1887 he brought about a conference of representatives of the various states and territories for a unification and improvement of the extradition laws, and represented New York at the conference. He was the author of the law providing for the reduction of sentences of convicts for good behavior, and directing that they be sentenced so that their terms shall expire during warm weather, when the opportunity to secure employment is greatest.

Since Mr. Brown has been State Commissioner in Lunacy, he has prepared laws providing for the appointment of women physicians in state hospitals for the insane; providing for the erection of free public baths in cities and towns; providing for a general scheme of fire protection in all institutions supported wholly or partly by the state, and providing that county authorities shall not contract for the care and maintenance of the poor. It was due in great measure to his efforts, too, that the state recently took charge of all the insane.

Mr. Brown has made many enemies by correcting abuses in asylums, especially the paying of excessive prices to local tradesmen for supplies, and these enemies did all in their power to prevent his reappointment. It is not believed, however, that their attacks impressed the Governor strongly. "The necessities of politics" seems to be the only plausible explanation of Mr. Brown's retirement.

The Democratic Senators, it was said to-day, have been investigating the political record of Mr. Van Amee, and have heard some things that will afford material for

speeches against his confirmation. They have learned that he not only declared in a newspaper letter last year that he was no longer a Democrat, but that he was an applicant for a place under the McKinley administration.

A Democratic Senator said this afternoon: "If the Governor announces squarely that he means to make the Lunacy Commission a solid Republican body, we shall have nothing to say about Mr. Van Amee's politics; but if he is put forward as a representative of the Democracy in the commission we will show that he is as good a Republican as his sponsor, Mr. Odell. I think that this appointment ought to kill the civil-service bill. The Governor was responsible for that bill, and he gained his present prominence chiefly on account of his civil-service-reform professions, yet when he has an excellent opportunity to carry his professed ideas into effect, he acts like a machine politician."

The Democrats also have information about extravagant fees charged by Mr. Van Amee as counsel for asylums. Mr. Van Amee may be confirmed, but the indications are that his nomination will give rise to one of the most interesting debates of the session.

OBJECTIONS TO MR. BROWN.

Runs His Department in Political Interests—Untrained Nurses Appointed.

H. E. Howland, President of the Board of Lunacy, said this morning that he thought the newspapers ought to look into the matter thoroughly before they criticise Gov. Roosevelt's action. He would make no statement as to his personal opinions on the merits of the case, but said merely that he thought the whole subject should be left with Gov. Roosevelt, and that he had investigated it thoroughly and was acting on his conviction of what was best. In regard to Mr. Van Amee's politics, Mr. Howland called him an independent Democrat. His repudiation was, Mr. Howland said, of Bryanism, not Democracy.

One whose position gives him opportunity to understand thoroughly Mr. Brown's methods of work while in office said that in most ways they were efficient, but that there was always politics in them. He says that Mr. Brown appointed machine Republicans as attorneys to the state hospitals, and in every way used to its full advantage all the patronage at his disposal; that the buildings in New York are ramshackle firetraps, and that patients were removed from them away from their friends, and from the care of the trained nurses of the city establishments, and placed, in better buildings, to be sure, but in the hands of untrained nurses and attendants appointed for political purposes. The efficient employees of the city institutions are thus shut out. This the Governor knows, and wants a man who will put the good buildings where they are needed, instead of transferring the patients for political reasons.

H. H. Hollister, the manager of the Manhattan State Hospital, said that he supported the Governor's action heartily. "There should be no politics in the matter of sickness and death," he said. "The minute politics gets into the Manhattan Hospital, out goes Mr. Hollister. Mr. Brown is certainly efficient and active. His methods are thorough, but there is too much politics in them. We needed no attorney for our hospital. We could get along perfectly well without one, and save money for the state, and I am sure the other hospitals could, too."

When asked about the transferring of patients for political purposes he said: "Just before the hospital was put under state control we had there nearly 6,500 patients. Ordinarily in that time there should be an increase of, well, say 10 per cent. As a matter of fact, we have now only a little more than 5,000 patients. The Governor's policy has always been to keep politics out of places where it does not belong. I believe that is what he is trying to do now, and he has my heartiest support in the effort. I don't know anything about Mr. Van Amee, but I have full trust in the Governor."

FRIDAY, APRIL 7, 1899

THE STATE LUNACY COMMISSION.

We think that Gov. ROOSEVELT owes to the public a more full and detailed statement of the reasons for naming Mr. VAN AMEE to succeed Mr. GOODWIN BROWN as the legal member of the State Lunacy Commission. On the facts as they stand, it seems to us that that action was extremely ill-advised and not easily reconciled with any theory of sound administration that the Governor acknowledges.

It has been stated that the Governor has received charges against Mr. BROWN. Of the exact nature of these charges the public is not informed. Mr. BROWN himself says that he has not been made acquainted with them directly. So far as they have come to his knowledge indirectly he has denied them. With regard to those said to have originated with Controller ROBERTS, that gentleman's indorsement of Mr. BROWN robs them of substantial weight, unless the Controller has ignored his own knowledge of objections to the appointment. His general reputation makes that improbable.

If the Governor has good reasons for refusing to retain Mr. BROWN in a position in which he has undoubtedly won the confidence of very good judges of his work, it appears to us that he ought to explain those reasons more clearly than he has done. But even if he has sufficient grounds for this refusal, his selection of Mr. VAN AMEE still requires explanation. It must be remembered that ordinary partisanship has nothing to do with this matter. It is the case of the replacement of one Democrat by another. The obvious requirement of common sense is that the new man shall be better than the old

one, and in the selection the machine cannot decently claim any voice. It is stated, however, and not denied, that in the choice of Mr. VAN AMEE the preference of Mr. ODELL, Chairman of the Republican State Committee, was very decided, and was consulted. If Mr. VAN AMEE were a better man than Mr. BROWN, Mr. ODELL'S preference would be of no great consequence. But the reverse appears to be the case. The new man is not, so far as has been shown, better fitted for the place, and he plainly is not a better type of Democrat. In these circumstances, Mr. ODELL'S backing of him is an impertinence, and the Governor's respect for it is mischievous. The worst feature of the modern spoils system is the treatment of public office, not merely as the reward of partisan service, but as a favor to be dispensed by a powerful politician without regard to party. The meanest and most insidiously corrupt politics is that kind in which the late THURLOW WEED declared "there is no politics."

Buffalo Courier
April 19/99

Why Not Reappoint Brown?

It is not plain why Gov. Roosevelt is so anxious to dispense with the valuable services of Goodwin Brown as a State Lunacy Commissioner. Mr. Brown was first appointed in 1893 as the legal member of the commission, and his services to the State are acknowledged to have been of great value. It was largely through Mr. Brown's efforts that the local trustees of State hospitals were required to buy supplies where they could be purchased the cheapest without regard to locality. It is not creditable to the Governor that he is so anxious to remove Mr. Brown. Every capable official makes enemies, but this should not lead the Governor of the State to remove a man who has taken a stand for economy in expenditures.

Mr. Brown is a Democrat and by statutory provision, his successor must be of that party, as the other two members, Dr. Peter M. Wise of New York and William L. Parkhurst of Canandaigua are Republicans. There should therefore be no politics in this appointment. Neither Dr. Wise nor Mr. Brown has allowed political considerations to influence the work of the Lunacy Commission. But the fact that Chairman Odell of the Republican State Committee induced the Governor to name William Van Amee of Newburg to succeed Mr. Brown led many to suppose that Mr. Odell saw a possibility of a political combination between Messrs. Parkhurst and Van Amee. The discovery that Van Amee voted for McKinley and now calls himself a Republican, led to the withdrawal of his nomination, as it would not have been confirmed.

Now the Governor has named William Church Osborn of Garrisons, Putnam County, which is not very far from Mr. Odell's city of Newburg. Mr. Osborn was born in Chicago, December 21, 1862, was graduated from Princeton in 1883 and from the Harvard Law School in 1888. After his admission to the bar, he began the practice of his profession in New York City. He was elected as a Democratic delegate to the Constitutional Convention of 1894, and in 1895 was the Democratic candidate for Senator in the Dutchess-Columbia-Putnam district. He was defeated by William C. Daley, Republican, a follower of Lou Payn, who received 3,042 plurality. Of Mr. Osborn's political affiliations since that time we know nothing.

CHANGE IN THE LUNACY COMMISSION.

The nomination of William Church Osborn to be State Commissioner in Lunacy was yesterday confirmed by the Senate. This action had been generally expected, and it is on all accounts to be commended. Mr. Osborn is a man of high character and ability, as all admit, and even those who had been most interested in securing another appointment were generous enough to see this and to refrain from opposing his confirmation. As was said in the Senate yesterday, the question before that body was not the merits of Commissioner Brown, who had not been selected for the office by the Governor, but the merits of Mr. Osborn, who had been selected, and Mr. Brown himself refused to allow himself to be used as an instrument to defeat Mr. Osborn's confirmation, and in spite of the fact that many Senators had urged his reappointment and might possibly have been disposed to block any other, the question was happily settled without controversy and with substantial unanimity.

The new Commissioner will enter upon his duties with the most favorable opportunity for making himself a reputation by continuing and extending the good work which has been done under the State care system. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of keeping this department free from politics and maintaining its administrative power in such full vigor that the separate hospitals will still be made to work as part of a State system and not under any consideration be allowed to fall once more under the domination of local interests and be made tenders of local politicians, tradesmen and contractors. A politician or a man easily influenced by local cliques, however honest their schemes, in Mr. Osborn's place might do irreparable injury, and it is a great satisfaction to know that the change which the Governor thought wise in the Commission has been accomplished without bringing any such dan-

ger. This was really the first critical change since the establishment of the State system. Happily the contractor and the reactionary have nothing more to hope for than of old. There will be no break in the continuity of reform in the maintenance of the insane.

While rejoicing in the character of the new Commissioner it is only just to acknowledge the debt of the State to the old. To Mr. Brown more than to any other one man is due the almost immeasurable improvement in our system for the care of the insane. As the active business man of the Commission from its formation, his honesty, his ability and his courage have been of the greatest value, and the people of this State have every reason to wish abundant prosperity in private life for the man who has served them for seventeen years and has, as Governor Roosevelt says, been "an excellent official."

NOMINATION CONFIRMED.

Senate Unites in Praising Lunacy Commissioner Brown.

The nomination of William Church Osborn, of New York, to succeed Goodwin Brown as a State commissioner of lunacy, was confirmed by the Senate yesterday by a vote of 40 ayes and 7 noes. Senators Grady, Cullen, Mackey, Martin, McCarren, Plunkitt and Ramsperger were the senators to cast the dissenting votes. The motion to confirm the Governor's nomination was responsible for general discussion, and all who spoke had nothing but kind words for Mr. Brown, and regrets that he was not renominated by Governor Roosevelt. The State Charities Aid society, of New York, which, through underhand means, opposed Mr. Brown's reappointment, was severely censured by all.

Senator Mackey moved to take up the report of the finance committee, and stated that the nomination displaces a man who had been a member of the lunacy commission since its organization. He spoke of Mr. Brown's valuable services as a member of that board, and what he had done to correct the evils in caring for insane patients, declaring that he had ever been an honest, competent and efficient official. There was no reason for displacing him; no reason, except that the Governor wants the place for a friend. He desired to call attention to the fact that the Governor, who had always claimed to be a staunch adherent of civil service, had violated every principle of civil service. A man who is a good officer should be retained in office. He cited some of the Governor's message to the Legislature in relation to the stand he would take on officers then in office. Goodwin Brown stands endorsed by more persons than any other appointee, Senator Mackey stated. He was endorsed by the State board of charities, people in the highest walks of life, and by 19 Republican Senators. The Governor's ante-election promises have been repeatedly broken, and he has ignored every principle of home rule and civil service.

Senator Elon R. Brown upheld the Governor, but at the same time paid a compliment to the retiring officer, and also spoke highly of the appointee.

Senator Raines was given unlimited time to make his address. He praised Mr. Brown as a competent officer, and declared that if Mr. Brown had not withdrawn he would have voted against the confirmation of any other man to the office to the end. He would not criticise the Governor for sending in the nomination of William Church Osborn, as he knew nothing derogatory to Mr. Osborn. He believed he was a man who did not seek the office. He next turned his attention to the attacks made upon Mr. Brown by the State Charities Aid society, and in scathing terms denounced its position. To counteract the letter which the society had written to the Governor on April 12, and which it had given wide publicity by giving to the press at the same time, he read a letter from President Schurmann, of Cornell University, in which he speaks of Mr. Brown's ability and his competency in the office.

Senator Grady's remarks were very sarcastic and humorous. He spoke of aristocracy and pink teas as being one of the requisites to hold office under Governor Roosevelt. The nomination breaks the last hope that any honest and painstaking official may entertain to be continued in office after serving the people honestly and capably.

Senator Ellsworth also announced that he regretted that Governor Roosevelt did not see fit to nominate Mr. Brown for reappointment.

Senator White made a grand stand play and threw wild gestures about for awhile, and only spoke of what a great and good patriot Governor Roosevelt is.

Senator McCarren and Stranahan also added their eulogies to Mr. Brown before voting.

LETTERS

Filed with Governor Roosevelt Regarding the Application

OF

GOODWIN BROWN

For Re-appointment as State Commissioner in Lunacy

ALSO

REMARKS IN THE SENATE

AND

RESOLUTIONS OF THE STATE COMMISSION IN LUNACY AND OF STATE HOSPITAL SUPERINTENDENTS PASSED UPON THE RETIREMENT OF COMMISSIONER BROWN

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Hon. Roswell P. Flower, Ex-Governor 5

Hon. James M. E. O'Grady, for many years Member of Assembly; twice Speaker of the Assembly; Member of Congress elect 5

Hon. T. E. Hancock, Attorney-General 5

Hon. A. J. Northrup, Ex-County Judge of Onondaga County; at present Statutory Revision Commissioner 5

Hon. Ashley W. Cole, President State Board Railroad Commissioners; Ex-Private Secretary to Governor Morton 6

Col. T. S. Williams, Secretary and Treasurer Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company; Ex-Private Secretary to Governors Hill and Flower 6

Hon. George B. Sloan, for many years State Senator; formerly Speaker of the Assembly; Chairman of Senate Finance Committee several terms 6

Hon. Sherman S. Rogers, Ex-State Senator; Ex-President New York State Bar Association 7

Dr. Carlos F. MacDonald, Ex-President State Commission in Lunacy; Ex-Superintendent of various hospitals for the insane for nearly twenty-five years; at present physician in charge and proprietor of a private institution for the insane at Pleasantville, N. Y. 7

Hon. Wilmot M. Smith, Justice New York Supreme Court, Patchogue 7

Rev. Dr. W. M. Brundage, Pastor First Unitarian Society of Albany 8

Hon. Alden Chester, Justice New York Supreme Court, Albany 8

Hon. M. L. Wright, Justice of New York State Supreme Court, Oswego 8

Hon. Robert Earl, Ex-Chief Justice New York State Court of Appeals 8

Dr. Truman J. Backus, President Board of Managers Long Island State Hospital; President Packer Institute, Brooklyn 9

Dr. J. G. Schurman, President Cornell University 9

Dr. William J. Milne, President New York State Normal College, Albany 9

Hon. Alfred C. Coxe, Judge United States District Court, Utica 10

Dr. A. S. Draper, President University of Illinois; formerly Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of New York; Ex-Judge United States Court of Alabama Claims 10

Dr. Melvil Dewey, Secretary New York State Board of Regents 10

Prof. J. W. Jenks, Professor of Political Science, Cornell University 10

Hon. Francis M. Burdick, Ex-Mayor, Utica; Ex-Professor of Law, Cornell University; Professor of Law, Columbia College Law School 11

Hon. Charles R. Skinner, many times a member of the Legislature; twice a member of Congress; twice Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of New York 11

George E. Dunham, Esq., member of Board of Managers, Utica State Hospital; Editor Utica Daily Press. 11

Prof. W. T. Hewett, Professor of German, Cornell University 12

Hon. Danforth E. Ainsworth, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction; many times a member of the Legislature; twice Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee 12

George E. Dodge, Esq., Manager of Manhattan State Hospital 12

Hon. A. J. French, formerly Manager Utica State Hospital; at present a Manager Binghamton State Hospital 13

Dr. Edwin H. Wolcott, Ex-President New York State Homeopathic Medical Society; present Manager Collins State Homeopathic Hospital 13

PAGE

Dr. G. Alder Blumer, Superintendent of the Utica State Hospital during the last ten years; formerly assistant physician for many years 13

Dr. E. H. Howard, for many years Superintendent of the Rochester State Hospital 14

Dr. William Mabon, Superintendent of the St. Lawrence State Hospital; formerly for many years Assistant Physician at the Utica State Hospital 14

Dr. Willis G. Tucker, Secretary Albany Medical College 14

Dr. E. A. Bartlett, Professor, Albany Medical College 14

Dr. Arthur G. Root, Professor, Albany Medical College 15

Giles S. Piper, Esq., Ex-Judge; Counsellor at Law, Fulton, Oswego Co., N. Y. 15

Adelbert Moot, Esq., Counsellor at Law, Buffalo 15

Hon. Edgar B. Jewett, formerly Mayor of Buffalo; President Columbia National Bank, Buffalo 15

Charles A. Pooley, Esq., Counsel to New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Co., Buffalo 16

Willis G. Nash, Esq., Cashier New York State National Bank, Albany 16

Hon. W. S. Wolcott, President Board Managers, Utica State Hospital 16

Dr. J. Montgomery Mosher, formerly Assistant Physician St. Lawrence State Hospital 16

Hon. Henry A. Reeves, Ex-Assemblyman; Ex-Congressman; for eight years a member of the State Commission in Lunacy 17

Right Rev. Thomas M. A. Burke, Bishop of Albany 17

Hon. James A. Roberts, Comptroller State of New York 18

Dr. Charles W. Pilgrim, Superintendent Hudson River State Hospital; formerly Superintendent of the Willard State Hospital; for many years assistant physician, Utica State Hospital 18

Willis E. Merriman, Deputy State Comptroller: in Comptroller's office for thirty years 18

Dr. John H. Finley, President Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., Formerly Secretary New York State Charities Aid Association 18

William F. Winship, Esq., Albany Manager, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company 19

Dr. Andrew MacFarlane, Lecturer Albany Medical College 19

Hon. Cornelius R. Parsons, Ex-Mayor Rochester, many years a member of the State Assembly and Senate. 19

Charles L. Stone, Esq., Ex-Corporation Counsel, Syracuse 20

Prof. R. W. Thomas, Professor of Rhetoric, Colgate University, formerly connected with the Board of Regents 20

Hon. William L. Parkhurst, State Commissioner in Lunacy; formerly member of the Assembly 20

Hon. Charles A. Collin, formerly member of the State Statutory Revision Commission; counsel to Governors Hill and Flower 21, 22

Hon. Frank D. Pavey, Ex-State Senator 22

Hon. John G. Milburn, Counsellor at Law, Buffalo 22

Rev. James P. Stratton, D.D., formerly of New York, now of Ohio 22

Hon. Edward B. Thomas, Ex-Attorney-General; Judge United States District Court 23

George H. Thornton, Esq., Supreme Court stenographer, Buffalo; formerly stenographer of Senate and Assembly 23

Dr. Harry A Wood, physician in charge, Providence Retreat, Buffalo (an institution for the insane); formerly a physician at the Buffalo State Hospital 23

Dr. Albert Vander Veer, physician and surgeon, Albany; Dean of Albany Medical College 23

Dr. Alfred B. Huested, president State Board of Pharmacy, Albany 24

Hon. Cuthbert W. Pound, Ex-Senator; now Professor of Law, Cornell University 24

Dr. W. E. Milbank, formerly member of the State Board of Health; physician in Albany 24

PAGE

Dr. Charles G. Wagner, formerly first assistant physician Utica State Hospital; now for many years superintendent Binghamton State Hospital 24

Dr. George E. Brewer, formerly on the staff of the Buffalo State Hospital; now a physician in New York.. 25

Frank B. Lown, Lawyer, Poughkeepsie; for many years a manager of the Hudson River State Hospital; now President of the Board 25

Dr. George E. Gorham, Physician, Albany 25

Major Charles J. Buchanan, Lawyer, Albany; on the staff of Gen. Oliver, National Guard 26

Hon. Walter Lloyd Smith, Judge Supreme Court, Elmira 26

Hon. William Cary Sanger, formerly member of Assembly; now Lieut-Colonel U. S. V 26

Hon. Stephen H. Hammond, formerly Deputy Attorney-General; for many years Manager Willard State Hospital; now President of the Board 26

Dr. H. E. Allison, formerly first assistant physician Willard State Hospital; for several years past Superintendent of the Matteawan State Hospital 27

W. E. Scripture, Justice Supreme Court 27

George C. Austin, Lawyer, New York City; formerly member of Assembly 27

W. L. Coughtry, Member Legislature from Albany County 27

Endorsement of nineteen Republican Senators 28

George B. Sloan, Ex-Speaker Assembly and Senate 28

Ehrick V. Rossiter, Architect, New York City 29

A. E. Orr, Manager, Long Island State Hospital, President Produce Exchange, President many Charitable Institutions 29

William C. Cornwell, one of the leading bankers, City of Buffalo 29

Remarks in Senate:

Senator William F. Mackey, Buffalo 30

Senator Elon R. Brown, Watertown, Chairman Fish, Forest and Game Committee 30, 33

Senator John Raines, Canandaigua, Chairman Railroads Committee 31

Senator Thomas F. Grady, New York City, Minority Leader 32

Senator Timothy E. Ellsworth, Lockport, Chairman Committee on Rules 33

Senator P. H. McCarren, Brooklyn 33

Senator Nevada N. Stranahan, Fulton, Chairman Cities' Committee 34

Senator Horace White, Syracuse, Chairman of Committee on Public Education 34

Resolutions of State Commission in Lunacy 34

Resolution of State Hospital Superintendents 34

Editorial from Brooklyn Eagle, April 5, 1899 35

Editorial from New York Tribune, April 6, 1899 36

Editorial from Utica Daily Press, April 7, 1899 37

Editorial from Troy Daily Times, April 7, 1899 37

597 Fifth Avenue,
New York, November 29, 1898.

My Dear Sir.— Goodwin Brown of the Lunacy Commission is a very competent and worthy man, and I trust if a Democrat is to be left on the Commission he is the proper man to fill the place. He has been conversant with all the details of the establishment of the system of State care of the insane, and I found his recommendations wise and prudent to follow.

I think a thorough acquaintance with Mr. Brown during the coming winter will confirm in you my good opinion of him.

Sincerely yours,
Roswell P. Flower,

Col. Theodore Roosevelt,
Governor-Elect State of New York.

STATE OF NEW YORK.

Speaker's Room.

Assembly Chamber,
James M. E. O'Grady, Speaker.

Rochester, December 2, 1898.

Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, Oyster Bay, L. I.:

Dear Sir.— The term of office of Goodwin Brown as Lunacy Commissioner will terminate so that his successor will have to be appointed by you during the coming session of the Legislature. I wish to recommend Mr. Brown for reappointment. While he differs from us in politics, his services are of such value to the State that this fact should outweigh largely any drawback there may be on account of his politics.

Mr. Brown has been connected with the Lunacy Commission since its beginning. Most of its wise and excellent procedure has been originated and formulated by him, and a careful investigation of the facts will verify all that has been said in his favor. If this Commission is to remain non-partisan, there is no sort of question but what Mr. Brown deserves reappointment; and his efficiency and good service to the State should go a long way towards urging its non-partisanship.

Very respectfully yours,
J. M. E. O'Grady.

STATE OF NEW YORK.

Attorney-General's Office,
Albany, December 7, 1898.

Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, Governor-Elect:

My Dear Sir.— I have had official relations with Hon. Goodwin Brown, a member of the State Lunacy Commission, ever since he has held a position upon that Board, formerly by reason of my holding the office of district attorney of Onondaga county, and for the last five years on account of my official position in Albany. I take pleasure in saying that I have always found him extremely active and zealous in the discharge of his duties, and know that he has been thoroughly interested in the work. I consider him a competent and efficient public official.

Yours respectfully,
T. E. Hancock.

Law Offices of
Northrup, Elliott & Northrup,
201, 203, 214 Kirk Building.

Syracuse, N. Y., December 7, 1898.

Hon. Goodwin Brown, State Commissioner in Lunacy, Albany, N. Y.:

Dear Sir.— I learn that your term as Commissioner expires in May next, and that a successor is likely to be appointed early in the coming session of the Legislature. If a Democrat is to be appointed, I know of no one who could present better reasons for the appointment than yourself. Your legal qualifications in general, and your thorough knowledge of the Insanity Law, of the institutions for the insane, their needs and the right methods for their management, are all in favor of your retention. Your *experience*, I believe, is invaluable in that office.

There certainly ought to be, as the law provides, a lawyer on the Commission, for evident reasons, and one, if possible, who has had some experience in connection with the supervision of insane hospitals. The *management* of insane hospitals is quite out of the line of our profession, and, I imagine, it would be difficult to find anywhere among active practitioners just the man fitted for their *supervision*.

As I had charge of the revision of the Insanity Law, and spent months in its preparation and in numerous conferences with you and the other members of the Commission, with the superintendents of hospitals and with legislative committees in working out its complex provisions, I have a pretty good idea of what is needed in a Commissioner, and of your qualifications for the position.

I know that your aid, both as a lawyer and as a Commissioner, was of the greatest value in the revision work.

I am frank to say that unless there is to be a change in the political construction of the Commission, I should think you were, for the reasons I have mentioned, the one man who is best fitted to succeed yourself.

I do not feel at liberty to formally recommend anyone, but I have frankly stated to you my opinion, and you are authorized to make any use of it you may desire.

Very truly yours,
A. Judd Northrup.

STATE OF NEW YORK.
BOARD OF RAILROAD COMMISSIONERS,
ASHLEY W. COLE, *Chairman.*

ALBANY, December 9, 1898.

DEAR SIR.— I am asked by friends to say a word in behalf of Mr. Goodwin Brown, the law member of the State Lunacy Commission, who desires to succeed himself in that Board on the expiration of his present term, in May next.

The Lunacy Commission has not been a partisan body. The first Board was selected by Governor Hill, and he placed Dr. Carlos F. MacDonald, a life-long Republican, at its head. If it should be your policy and purpose to continue this bi-partisan character in the membership of the Board, then I beg most earnestly and respectfully to commend Mr. Brown to your favorable consideration.

To my personal knowledge, gained in my capacity as private secretary to Governor Morton, Mr. Brown is and has been for the past four years at least the active, hardest-working and *resident* member of that Board. Governor Morton invariably consulted him in regard to the labors, duties and expenditures of the Board, both before he became Governor (for purposes of his first annual message) and during his term as Governor.

Very respectfully,
ASHLEY W. COLE.

Col. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Governor-Elect, etc.

BROOKLYN RAPID TRANSIT COMPANY,
BROOKLYN, N. Y., December 8, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect:

DEAR SIR.— In the interest of intelligent and faithful administration of the task of supervising the institutions for the insane poor of the State, permit me to express the hope that you will continue in office the Hon. Goodwin Brown, one of the present Commissioners in Lunacy. Commissioner Brown has been connected with this work from its incipiency, and it is owing to his efforts and energy that the great reform in the care of the pauper insane was so successfully inaugurated and established. Those of us who were in Albany at that time appreciated well the difficulties of various kinds which surrounded the establishment of the policy of State care, and I think all will cordially unite in attributing no small part of the success of State care to Commissioner Brown. His very aggressiveness and enthusiasm aroused much opposition among the friends and advocates of the old county system, and he made himself quite unpopular in some quarters by his advocacy of the cause of State care, but the fact that the policy of State care has been so conspicuously triumphant vindicates Mr. Brown's earnestness and the intelligent attention which he has given to the subject. He is one of the State officers who, upon his retirement from office, can carry with him the satisfaction of having been instrumental in instituting one of the greatest reforms in recent years. To continue him in office under your administration would be a generous recognition of his services and a reward for official well-doing.

Very truly yours,
T. S. WILLIAMS,
Secretary and Treasurer.

SECOND NATIONAL BANK,
OSWEGO, N. Y., November 15, 1898

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect of the State of New York:

DEAR SIR.— With your permission, I would like to say a word in commendation of the services rendered the State by the Hon. Goodwin Brown, a member of the Commission in Lunacy.

It was my fortune to be a member of the Senate when this Commission was created, and also, long enough afterward to know something of the degree of efficiency with which the obligations resting on the Commissioners were fulfilled. From these opportunities of observation, acting as I was then, as chairman of the finance committee, I came to respect Mr. Brown as a faithful, vigilant and upright officer, striving always to serve the best interests of the State, regardless of other considerations.

I may say in that connection, that his attention to all of the matters within the province of his supervision gave him a knowledge of the merits and demerits of tendencies and methods prevailing in the various institutions under the care of the Commission,— a knowledge only acquired through personal relations with their administration covering a considerable period of time, at once valuable and desirable as it seems to me to retain, as a factor of State supervision. A new official would not soon gain that knowledge, and until gained, his services would be correspondingly less efficient.

The Commission is expected to be a non-partisan body, its composition being partly Republican and partly Democratic, and in recognition of the obligation to make the first appointments on those lines, Mr. Brown was chosen as a representative Democrat. He has been known, however, as a pronounced sound money man, but not aggressively inclined in his general action politically. His uppermost thought has always seemed to me to be, how best to carry on the work of the Lunacy Commission to secure salutary results, outside of politics.

I am of the opinion that no step could be taken, more conducive to the end sought by the originators of the Commission, than the appointment of Mr. Brown to serve as his own successor. In the event of that action being taken, I can hardly conceive of dissatisfaction on the part of anybody, who wants faithful and efficient service, and I believe there will be none. Therefore, I beg to indulge the hope, that Mr. Brown's candidacy will receive your favorable consideration, and remain,

Very respectfully yours,
GEO. B. SLOAN.

ROGERS, LOCKE & MILBURN,
Counselors at Law,
28 Erie Street.
BUFFALO, N. Y., 9th December, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, New York City:

MY DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT.— The present State Commissioner in Lunacy, Goodwin Brown, Esq., was for some time a student in my office and I knew him very well and very favorably for several years. I am not familiar with his work as a public officer, but my general understanding of the subject is that it has been faithful and satisfactory.

He would like a line from me to you favoring his reappointment, and I give it to him with much pleasure. If he has been as good an officer as I think he has, I can imagine no reason why he should not be continued in the place.

Yours most respectfully,
SHERMAN S. ROGERS.

December 9, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect of the State of New York:

MY DEAR SIR.— I trust you will pardon me for taking the liberty of trespassing on your valuable time by writing you a few words respecting the coming vacancy in the legal membership of the State Commission in Lunacy.

As president of the Commission from the time of its creation in May, 1889, to October 1, 1896, when I resigned in order to resume private practice, I was intimately associated with the present legal member of the Commission, Mr. Goodwin Brown, and had opportunity probably greater than anyone else to observe the character of the man and the manner in which he discharged the duties of the office which he has filled for nearly ten years with great credit to himself and greater benefit to that department of the State service.

Indeed, Mr. Brown's whole career in the public service has been marked by intelligent, active and painstaking devotion to duty to a degree which I have rarely seen excelled in a public official, and I have no hesitation in saying that, in view of his ripe experience in and familiarity with the duties of the office, together with the exceptionally high order of native executive ability which he possesses, as well as his honesty, integrity and high sense of duty, I believe him to be the best equipped man in the State for this responsible position.

Too much credit cannot be given to Mr. Brown for the valuable services he has rendered to the State, whether as regards the active part he took in the memorable struggle for the establishment of State care for the dependent insane, or in the subsequent organization of the department of lunacy administration, many of the details of which he personally worked out, and which has given the people of this commonwealth a State hospital system for her insane that is second to none in the world.

Such being the case, I trust you will see your way clear to giving the State the further benefit of Mr. Brown's services, as I feel confident that his reappointment would meet with general public approval.

I would beg to further call your attention to the fact that up to the present time the Commission in Lunacy has been practically free from partisan influences or control. Its first members, appointed by Governor Hill, consisted of two Democrats, Messrs. Brown and Reeves, and one Republican, myself. Subsequently Governor Morton reappointed me for a second term. When I resigned at the end of a year thereafter, my successor was also a Republican. Since then Governor Black has appointed a Republican successor to Mr. Reeves, so that the Commission now consists of two Republicans and one Democrat.

In view of the great importance of keeping the government of the State hospitals and the care and treatment of our insane free from and above partisan influences, I venture, as a life-long Republican, to suggest that it would be in the interests of humanity and of "good politics" as well, if the present "political balance" of the Commission was maintained, and to that end I would respectfully and cordially commend Mr. Brown's reappointment to your favorable consideration.

The only objection, other than party ones, that is likely to be made to Mr. Brown is that he has been too radical in behalf of the insane and in the enforcement of needed measures of reform in the management of institutions therefor. Should opposition on this ground be successful, it cannot result otherwise than detrimental to the public interests. Whereas, encouragement of the faithful discharge of official duties makes for the promotion of a sound civil service policy.

Wishing your administration the fullest measure of success, I am,

Most respectfully and sincerely yours,
CARLOS F. MACDONALD, M. D.

85 Madison avenue, New York.

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
BROOKLYN, N. Y., December 10, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT:

MY DEAR SIR.— If you shall continue the policy of giving to each party representation upon the State Commission in Lunacy, I take great pleasure in recommending for reappointment my friend, Mr. Goodwin Brown. I have known Mr. Brown for twenty-five years, and from what I know personally of his character and from what I can learn from others who know his record as a public official, I believe it will be for the best interest of the State to continue him in his present position.

Yours truly,
WILMOT M. SMITH.

111 Lake Avenue,
ALBANY, N. Y., December 9, 1898.

The Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT:

MY DEAR SIR.— For several years I have followed with a great deal of interest and satisfaction the development of the State care for the insane to its present high degree of efficiency. No department of the State government seems to me to be worthier of commendation, and I believe that no man has been more directly responsible in securing this result than Mr. Goodwin Brown.

I have been intimately acquainted with Mr. Brown for nearly four years. He is a man of strong convictions and high ideals. There have been no "politics" in his department since the very beginning of his administration. He has worked energetically and persistently to serve the State, and to promote the best interests of the insane. No one has ever been able to question either the efficiency of his service or its perfectly disinterested character. I know of no man in public life whose personal integrity is more unassailable. He is honored and esteemed by all intelligent and public-spirited citizens of Albany.

As a private citizen, entirely outside of all politics, I would respectfully request you to favorably consider the reappointment of Mr. Brown as Commissioner in Lunacy upon the expiration of his present term of office.

Very respectfully yours,
WILLIAM MILTON BRUNDAGE.

Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Albany, N. Y.

STATE OF NEW YORK.

SUPREME COURT CHAMBERS,
ALBANY, N. Y., December 3, 1898.

MY DEAR SIR.— I write to urge the reappointment of Hon. Goodwin Brown as one of the State Commissioners in Lunacy at the expiration of his present term of service. He has filled the office long and faithfully and his record speaks for itself. I think it is not too much to say that no man is entitled to more credit than he for inaugurating and procuring the adoption of the plan for the State care of lunatics and for developing and perfecting the present efficient State system, which I believe is now one of the most wise, humane and beneficial in any State or country. Although Mr. Brown is a Democrat, I have yet to learn that he has ever allowed partisanship to influence his official action. I believe the State can ill-afford to lose his valuable services and I trust you may see your way clear to reappoint him.

With high regard, I am,

Sincerely yours,
ALDEN CHESTER.

The Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Governor-Elect.

Supreme Court Justices's Chambers,
M. L. WRIGHT, J. S. C.

OSWEGO, N. Y., November 21, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect:

MY DEAR SIR.— I desire to recommend the Hon. Goodwin Brown for reappointment as Commissioner in Lunacy. Though I am a Republican and he a Democrat, I am constrained to make this recommendation by my deep conviction that the interests of the great department of the State government of which he is a member will be better subserved and promoted by his retention in office than by the appointment of any new man living.

His genius originated the scheme for the State care of the insane, and its present great and philanthropic system was organized and has been developed under his masterful guidance.

He possesses great executive ability and the breadth of intellect, force, aggressiveness and fearlessness which are essentially requisite for the supervision and control of the superintending officers of the various institutions under the charge of the Lunacy Commission.

He also possesses that absolute honesty and devotion to duty which are requisite to the honest disbursements of the vast sums of money controlled by that department.

While he is a member of that Commission there will be no scandal connected with that department. If any irregularity should be discovered I should expect to hear from his voice a tremendous *row*.

I sincerely hope he may be reappointed.

Yours with great admiration and regard,
M. L. WRIGHT.

HERKIMER, January 2, 1899.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT:

DEAR GOVERNOR.— I recommend Hon. Goodwin Brown for reappointment as a member of the State Commission in Lunacy. He has been a Commissioner for several years and is recognized throughout the State as a most capable and efficient official.

Very truly yours,
R. EARL.

STATE OF NEW YORK.
LONG ISLAND STATE HOSPITAL,
MEDICAL DEPARTMENT,

BROOKLYN, N. Y., November 18, 1898.

Col. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect of the State of New York:

SIR.— My acquaintance with the practical working of the system of State care for the insane has satisfied me that the Commission in Lunacy should be *non-partisan.*

The only Democrat in the present Commission is the Hon. Goodwin Brown, and his term is about expiring. The statute requires that one member of the Commission be a lawyer. Mr. Brown is the present legal member.

His *experience* and the character of his service qualify him for his present position. He has been a member of the Commission for ten years. He drew the present "Lunacy Law." He led the fight against the corrupt rings that were determined to perpetuate abominations of the former county care of the insane.

Commissioner Brown has strong convictions, is devoted to the welfare of the State's unfortunates, and is a strong and square fighter when he knows that he is right.

He is about forty years of age, is in perfect health, is an active, indefatigable, kindly aggressive man.

It is of utmost importance that the legal member of the Commission be personally and professionally *courageous and honest.* Such a man I believe Commissioner Brown to be, beyond all question.

I respectfully recommend and would urge that at the expiration of his present term, Commissioner Brown be reappointed a Commissioner in Lunacy.

I am, my dear sir,

Most respectfully,
(Signed) TRUMAN J. BACKUS,
President of the Board of Managers, The L. I. State Hospital.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

ITHACA, N. Y., November 26, 1898.

DEAR SIR.— I understand that the term of Mr. Goodwin Brown as State Commissioner in Lunacy expires next year, and I presume you will send nominations to the Senate at an early date in the session.

I take the liberty of saying that I have long known Mr. Brown, who is an old student of Cornell University, and that I have always heard his work as State Commissioner in Lunacy spoken of with the highest approval. Reappointments on merit are demanded by the principles of a sound civil service; and I believe Mr. Brown's record will be found to bring his case under this general rule. I take great pleasure in commending him to your favorable consideration.

Very respectfully yours,
J. G. SCHURMAN.

The Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Governor-Elect of the State of New York.

NEW YORK STATE.
NORMAL COLLEGE.
WILLIAM J. MILNE, Ph. D., LL. D., *President.*

ALBANY, November 25, '98.

Hon. GOODWIN BROWN, State Commission in Lunacy, Albany, N. Y.:

MY DEAR MR. BROWN.— As I understand the matter your term of office will expire before a great while and it will become a duty of Gov. Roosevelt to appoint your successor. The other members of the Commission are Republicans, I think, and for that reason I hope that Gov. Roosevelt may appoint a Democrat and in my judgment he is quite likely to do so. If it should be his intention to honor both parties upon the Commission I know that there is no man in the State of New York who is fitter to serve in that capacity than yourself. Your large experience in such work, your thorough familiarity with the best methods for caring for the insane, and your rigid and exact business methods will commend you to him in a very high degree, I am sure.

I do not expect to be able to influence Gov. Roosevelt in any way because I have no personal acquaintance with him, but I feel very sure that he will be induced upon the ground of your fitness to consider your case very carefully, and, it seems to me, to give you an appointment.

If I can serve you in any way further in this matter, I shall esteem it a pleasure to do so for I regard your qualifications for the office as superior in every respect. You will have, no doubt, plenty of endorsers whom Gov. Roosevelt will know, but I desire to express to you the hope that you may be able to secure the appointment, because your talents and your experience entitle you to it.

Very sincerely yours,
WILLIAM J. MILNE.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
CHAMBERS OF THE JUDGE,
UTICA, N. Y., December 7, 1898.

(Dictated.)

MY DEAR SIR.— Friends here have asked me to write recommending the reappointment of Mr. Goodwin Brown as Commissioner in Lunacy. Years ago I was one of the managers of the State Hospital at Utica and as Mrs. Coxe is now a manager I am somewhat familiar with the subject generally and with the work of the present Commission. I take pleasure in saying that Mr. Brown is thoroughly acquainted with the work and is enthusiastically interested in it. His expert knowledge is most valuable to the State. He is absolutely honest. He is a Democrat, but I am informed that he is not "pernicious," and if the Commission is to be kept non-partisan, as in my judgment it should be, his politics will be a recommendation.

Very respectfully,
ALFRED C. COXE.

The Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Governor-Elect, etc., etc., etc.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS — PRESIDENT'S OFFICE.
CHAMPAIGN, Illinois, December 7, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect of New York:

MY DEAR SIR.— I take the liberty of saying that I have known much of the work of Mr. Goodwin Brown in the State Commission in Lunacy, and that I think it would be a distinct loss to the State of New York if he were to be retired from the Commission. I suppose it is hardly saying too much to say that he organized the plan of operations which has really come to be known throughout the country as the New York plan, and has reflected great credit upon the State. I know that he showed more energy and courage than any one else in fighting the disgraceful conditions which were found to exist throughout the State when the counties had the care of the insane. He was both ridiculed and reviled for persisting in a course which every decent man has been ready to approve. I think the State owes much to him. I suppose it is accepted that the Commission ought to be non-partisan. I think it always has been. As to that matter, Mr. Brown is not very much of a partisan anyway but an exceedingly upright and conscientious man, thoroughly devoted to the work in which he has had so much experience.

With much respect, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
A. S. DRAPER.

UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.
REGENTS' OFFICE,
ALBANY, N. Y., 8 D '98.

To whom it may concern:

From the establishment of the Commission in Lunacy, I have had opportunity to notice the practical workings of the office and have recognized, in common with all who have seen the splendid development of the new system, the increase in efficiency, the saving to the State by business methods and by earnest attention to the public welfare, that we had in Commissioner Goodwin Brown a man who, early and late, gave his best thought and work to the practical service of the State in the place to which he had been appointed. It is a pleasure to bear witness to public duty so satisfactorily performed, specially as there is not the slightest personal or political reason for so doing. It seems to me only just, when a public officer has been specially efficient and faithful in the disch arge of his duties, that those who are cognizant of the fact should add their testimony. No other State department with which I am acquainted has been so careful in adopting labor-saving methods and devices and in securing assistants trained to render the best service for the salaries offered. and in these efforts it has been Commissioner Brown whom I have uniformly found giving his keenest personal attention to the improvements.

MELVIL DEWEY,
Secretary.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE.
ITHACA, N. Y., Dec. 8, 1898.

Gov. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Albany, N. Y.:

DEAR SIR.— During the last few years I have known something of the work of Mr. Goodwin Brown as State Commissioner in Lunacy. He has lectured for us at Cornell University regarding the work of his Commission, and I have looked with some care into the work of the Commission at Albany. While I cannot venture to speak as an expert on the subject, or as one very intimately acquainted with Mr. Brown's personal work. it has still seemed to me that he has manifested great interest and diligence in his department and that the work has been conducted with much intelligence and success. Certainly very great improvements in the care of the insane have been made, and I have had reason to believe that these improvements were due, in good measure, to Mr. Brown's own efforts. His experience, too, cannot fail to be of great service in the work. His reappointment would seem to me wise, as in the interests of the State and of the unfortunates who are placed under the care of the Commission.

Very respectfully yours,
J. W. JENKS.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK.
(School of Law.)

December 8, 1898.

The Honorable THEODORE ROOSEVELT:

DEAR SIR.— Having known Mr. Goodwin Brown before his appointment to the State Commission in Lunacy, I have watched his conduct in that position with considerable interest. So far as I can judge, he has been an able and faithful officer, increasing in usefulness each year.

I hope, therefore, he may be reappointed at the expiration of his present term.

I have the honor to be,

Very respectfully yours,
FRANCIS M. BURDICK.

STATE OF NEW YORK.
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE,
ALBANY, December 9, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Oyster Bay, N. Y.:

MY DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT.— If you shall finally determine to preserve the non-partisan character of the Commission in Lunacy, I want to speak a word in commendation of Goodwin Brown, one of the commissioners, whose term will soon expire. Although Mr. Brown is nominally a Democrat, he is not given to "offensive partisanship," but he subordinates his politics to public duty.

I have known Mr. Brown all my life. He is a gentleman of high character and splendid executive ability. The Lunacy Commission to-day is one of the best organized and best regulated departments of the State government. I know of no officer who has closer knowledge of all the details connected with his department than Mr. Brown. It is due to his administrative ability that the Commission to-day is on such satisfactory footing. An examination into its affairs would satisfy you that they are carefully watched and all who are acquainted with its workings give Mr. Brown credit for wise discretion in the direction of important interests.

He has devoted his entire time to acquiring an acquaintance with details, in perfecting forms of reports and in close inspection of those connected with the institutions under his charge.

Yours sincerely,
CHARLES R. SKINNER.

UTICA PRESS.

GEO. E. DUNHAM, *Editor.*
UTICA, N. Y., November 26, 1898.

Col. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, New York City:

MY DEAR SIR.— Among the positions you will have to fill is that of Lunacy Commissioner in the place of Hon. Goodwin Brown, whose time expires next year. The object of this letter is to urge upon the executive the importance of his reappointment. I feel some familiarity with lunacy matters in this State, because of eleven years' service as one of the managers of the State Hospital at Utica, by appointment of Governors Hill, Flower and Morton. I was a manager before State care was talked about, when it was inaugurated and now under its successful continuance.

Personally, in politics, I am an independent Republican, and it gave me great pleasure to support your candidacy this fall, not so much because you were a Republican, but because I thought you were the best man for the place. I believe that practical politics ought to be kept as far as possible from the management of State hospitals. I can testify that in the last eleven years political considerations have not controlled in any degree in Utica or in any way through the Commission. There are three Lunacy Commissioners, one of whom should belong to the minority and the other two to the majority. Dr. Wise and Mr. Parkhurst are Republicans, Mr. Brown a Democrat. The Commission has always been thus divided, and I think it always should be. The worst thing which could happen to the State hospitals would be for partisan politics to assert itself in their management.

Though I have differed very materially on some matters from Mr. Brown I have always recognized the sincerity of his purpose and the honesty of his intentions, and more than once I have come to know that he was right and I wrong. He began with the State care system and built it up, understanding it in all its multitude of details, and with remarkable executive ability has always been the wheel-horse of the Commission. He thoroughly knows his business and is conscientiously upright in the discharge of his duty. The smartest man you could name would have to spend two or three years to learn what Mr. Brown knows about the State hospitals and their affairs. Meantime the service would suffer. I am sure that in all the State you can find no other person so well qualified for this place as Mr. Brown. In the interest of the service, in which I am deeply interested and about which I have no ends to accomplish, or axes to grind, I am earnestly in favor of his reappointment.

Had I any personal claim on your attention I would urge his appointment on that ground, but the best interests of 20,000 insane people and many times as many more who are, or who believe themselves to be sane, entitles any man to address the Governor-elect on a matter of this importance. Hoping you can see this candidacy in the light which all familiar with the service see it, I am,

Yours sincerely,
GEO. E. DUNHAM.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

ITHACA, N. Y., December 9, 1898.

The Honorable THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor of the State of New York:

DEAR SIR.— I have been, for several years, familiar with the work of the State Commission in Lunacy, and I have come to attach a high value to the services of the Honorable Goodwin Brown in connection with it. Much of the admirable system of the State, especially in the codification of the statute involving the entire system of the administration of our State hospitals, is due to him.

I think it also of value that the non-partisan character of the Commission should be preserved. Mr. Brown's experience is such that it seems that he is better fitted to carry forward the work successfully than a new appointee.

I am, dear sir,

Yours very truly,
W. T. HEWETT.

STATE OF NEW YORK.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE,
ALBANY, November 25, 1898.

To His Excellency, Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Executive Chamber, Capitol, Albany, N. Y.:

MY DEAR SIR.— I do not know what view you will take of the statute creating the State Lunacy Commission, and do not wish to express any opinion as to your duty in that respect.

Should you, however, arrive at the conclusion that the interests of the State and the intent of the law required that board to be bi-partisan in its personnel, I wish to say of Hon. Goodwin Brown, who has been connected with this board since its organization, that I think the successful inauguration of the State care for the insane is largely owing to his ability as an executive officer.

When I was in the Legislature I gave to this principle my earnest support, believing it to be the wisest and most humane solution of the question of the proper care of the insane. When the board was organized my duties as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee made it incumbent upon me to familiarize myself with the workings of this department and the expenditure of the vast sums of money under their control. I was astonished at the complete and perfect system inaugurated in that department under Mr. Brown's administration. I do not believe there is another State department so carefully organized, with greater attention to detail, or with more satisfactory results. The fund disbursed is among the largest under the control of any State department, and the system is so complete that there is less loss and more care exercised in its disbursement than in any other branch of the State government, I am confident.

Should you determine that the intent of the statute and the policy of the State dictated that one of Mr. Brown's political faith should be a member of that board, my own judgment, expressed unhesitatingly, would be that Commissioner Brown should be retained. Added to his ability as an executive officer, is an unimpeachable character, and I speak from personal knowledge in this respect, having known Mr. Brown intimately while a law student in my own county.

Yours most respectfully,
DANFORTH E. AINSWORTH.

GEORGE E. DODGE,
156 Fifth Avenue.

NEW YORK, November 17, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor of the State of New York:

DEAR SIR.— I beg to call your kind attention to the fact that I am one of the members of the Board of Managers of the Manhattan State Hospital for the care of the insane.

You will remember, perhaps, that about three years ago, under the State Care Act, this Manhattan State Hospital was taken out of the hands of the Tammany machine and placed under the care of the State.

I feel sure that we will be able to prove to you, when you are able to get time to examine the condition of our hospital, that this change has been, in every way, beneficial to the patients and for the best interests of the State.

To carry out the plans that have been perfected and that are now in operation, it is most important that the men who are serving on the State Commission in Lunacy should be of the very highest class in every respect. They have large responsibilities and need to be men of tried experience.

The term of one of the members of the board, the Honorable Goodwin Brown, expires in the spring of 1899. I consider that it is of great importance to the best interests of the State that Mr. Brown should be reappointed. To Mr. Brown, more than to any one else, belongs the credit for suggesting and pushing through to completion the State Care Act. The results that have been achieved show that his judgment as to this matter was correct in every detail.

During the three years that I have been on the board of the Manhattan State Hospital I have watched with great care Mr. Brown's work in the Lunacy Commission. He is very earnest and efficient in all that he does, and is an indefatigable worker. He is thoroughly acquainted with the needs of all the various hospitals under the control of his Commission, and he is particularly fitted and adapted to this work.

I should consider it a great loss to the State if he should retire, as it would take any new man several years to acquire the knowledge and experience that Mr. Brown now has. I feel confident that Mr. Brown will be warmly endorsed by the citizens throughout the State, who have had anything to do with the care of the insane.

Trusting you will give this matter your usual kind consideration, I am,

Respectfully yours,
GEO. E. DODGE.

THE NATIONAL STATE BANK OF ONEIDA.

ONEIDA, N. Y., November 18, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect:

MY DEAR SIR.— I understand that the term of Mr. Goodwin Brown as Lunacy Commissioner expires some time in May, 1899.

The Commission as at present organized consists of two Republicans and one Democrat. I have been acquainted with Mr. Brown many years. During the three years last past I have occupied the position as one of the managers of the Utica State Hospital and the Binghamton State Hospital, by appointment from Governor Morton.

During my term of office I have been particularly observant of the work of the Commission of which Mr. Brown has been a prominent factor. I deem him peculiarly well qualified for the position, and feel that if he should be reappointed it would be for the best interests of the State.

Yours very respectfully,

A. J. FRENCH.

STATE OF NEW YORK.

COLLINS STATE HOMEOPATHIC HOSPITAL.

57 SOUTH UNION STREET,

ROCHESTER, N. Y., December 6, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect of the State of New York:

MY DEAR SIR.— It is with special pride and satisfaction that I herewith urge you to reappoint Commissioner Goodwin Brown, of the State Commission in Lunacy, when his present term of office shall have expired. Having been a manager of the above hospital for two years, and familiar with all its affairs with the Commission since the hospital was organized, I am in a position to officially know Mr. Brown, and am glad of an opportunity to express my heartiest approval of the faithful, efficient, honest and economical services of this officer. We have expended nearly half a million of dollars on the hospital, including the purchase of the farm of five hundred acres, during the last five years, and Commissioner Brown has been especially zealous in caring for the interests of the State, and equally watchful and suspicious of any wrongdoing within his knowledge.

Hoping that you may see your way clear to endorse this capable officer by reappointment, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

EDWIN H. WOLCOTT.

STATE OF NEW YORK.

UTICA STATE HOSPITAL.

G. ALDER BLUMER, M. D.,
Superintendent.

UTICA, N. Y., December 8, 1898.

To the Honorable THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect of the State of New York:

DEAR SIR.— It is a matter of extreme delicacy for the superintendent of a State hospital to interest himself, even by indirection, in the *personnel* of a Lunacy Commission. The natural inference of a governor— presumably a student of human nature — is that the candidate for appointment whom the subordinate superintendent favors is the very man whom the executive should avoid. And yet one who has seen long service in this department of State work may be pardoned if he suggests as not untenable, not inconsistent with absolute sincerity, a view of that service broader than self, proceeding from a genuine interest in the welfare of the insane and born of a public ministry to and among them extending over a period of nearly a score of years.

With this introduction, I venture to bespeak your excellency's favorable consideration of the reappointment as Lunacy Commissioner of Mr. Goodwin Brown, whose term of office will soon expire. Whatever else may be said of the legal member of the Commission, his intense and intelligent interest in the work of the service — witness whereof may be readily found in his achievements — cannot be denied by any critic of his qualifications. If his official acts have at times brought him into sharp conflict with men, resentment has been the result of his determination to do, at any hazard, his full duty to the State as he saw it. In this respect Mr. Brown has impressed me as a personality all but unique in these days of subserviency to powers that be or are supposed to be in the timid view of less vertebrate servants of the State. I am sure, too, that Mr. Brown need fear no comparison by that standard of official cleanness, furnished by the animal kingdom, and established by you in your public speeches as that by which every servant of the State shall be measured.

Perhaps such assurances may come with some grace from myself, who, several years ago, was in bitter controversy with Mr. Brown, and who to-day, in looking back on that period of storm and stress, have no difficulty in finding its occasion in the very qualities that have made him so efficient a commissioner. Your own well-known views regarding the civil service of the State and nation encourage one to believe that in any circumstances your pleasure would be to reappoint a tried official who deserves well of the commonwealth. Certainly your Excellency would find in Mr. Brown an upright commissioner, who would use his influence to save the State from the clutch of so-called "practical politics," and ever employ his conspicuous talents as a public servant in safeguarding the interest of the insane as the helpless wards of the State.

I have the honor to be,

Yours very respectfully,

G. ALDER BLUMER.

STATE OF NEW YORK — ROCHESTER STATE HOSPITAL.

December 5, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Oyster Bay, L. I., N. Y.:

MY DEAR SIR.— In behalf of the best interests of the insane, I respectfully urge you to reappoint Mr. Goodwin Brown as a member of the State Commission in Lunacy.

His able and earnest work has been an essential factor in perfecting the New York State system for the care of the insane, which is justly conceded to be the most excellent.

His probity, experience, sterling ability and force are invaluable, and being in a position to have positive knowledge relative thereto, I take the liberty to write you and bespeak his reappointment.

Very respectfully yours,

E. H. HOWARD,
Superintendent.

STATE OF NEW YORK — ST. LAWRENCE STATE HOSPITAL.

OGDENSBURG, N. Y., December 7, 1898.

DEAR SIR.— Permit me to trespass upon your valuable time to bring to your attention as chief executive a matter of highest importance to the State of New York.

Since the creation of the Commission in Lunacy, in 1889, the Hon. Goodwin Brown has had the honor to be the legal member of the Commission. Of the value and extent of the service of his membership of this body few persons not directly and intimately connected with the general administration of lunacy affairs can have any adequate idea.

The State, as you are no doubt aware, assumed entire charge of its dependent insane in 1893. The numberless details of the transfer from county to State, as well as the elaboration of the scheme of State care, were largely imposed upon Commissioner Brown.

His indefatigable efforts, judgment and courage have done much to bring the New York State care to its high state of efficiency.

I hope you will favorably consider his reappointment.

His valuable services are recognized by all officials having intimate knowledge of the work at hand.

I write this letter, which is unsolicited, entirely from a sense of duty — for the continuation of the present wise administration in the department of the Commission in Lunacy.

I have the honor to remain,

Very respectfully yours,

WILLIAM MABON,
Superintendent.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Oyster Bay, L. I., N. Y.

CHEMICAL LABORATORY.
Albany Medical College, Albany, N. Y.
WILLIS G. TUCKER, M. D.

ALBANY, December 9, 1898.

The Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Oyster Bay, N. Y.:

DEAR SIR.— Understanding that Mr. Goodwin Brown's term of service by appointment upon the State Lunacy Commission is about to expire, may I, without presuming in any manner to offer any suggestion as to the future complexion of this Commission, be allowed, most respectfully to say, that in the event of your deeming it wise to allow it to remain as at present constituted, that, in my judgment, Mr. Brown's retention upon the Commission would meet with general approval. I feel that my knowledge of the affairs of this Commission justifies me in saying that Mr. Brown has been a valuable member of the same. He has stood for humanitarian interests in the care of the helpless and unfortunate classes who are under the care of this Commission, and he has exercised a wise discretion in the discharge of his responsible duties. From a personal acquaintance of many years' standing, I am glad to add my testimony to the value of his services in this very important branch of our State service.

I am, sir, with sincere respect,

Yours very truly,
WILLIS G. TUCKER.

E. A. BARTLETT, M. D.,
20 So. Hawk st.

ALBANY, N. Y., December 9, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect:

DEAR SIR.— As a physician, I have followed with interest the work of the New York State Commission in Lunacy since its establishment. Without in the least depreciating the work of the other members of the Commission, I realize how much faithful work Mr. Goodwin Brown has done as the legal member of the Commission. Sturdily upright, he has followed the grand example set by you in reforming abuses, without fear or favor; by constant careful oversight he has been able to suggest much to improve the condition and maintenance of the State hospitals. The Commission has always been non-partisan, and I wish you might see your way clear to reappoint Mr. Brown upon the expiration of his term, as thereby I am sure the interests of the State will be both conserved and subserved.

I am, sir,
Very sincerely yours,
E. A. BARTLETT.

ARTHUR G. ROOT, M. D.,
46 Eagle street, Albany, N. Y.

ALBANY, December 6, 1898.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor, State of New York:

MY DEAR SIR.— Having learned that there are many people throughout the State, both Republicans and Democrats, who are much interested to see Mr. Goodwin Brown, of the State Lunacy Commission, perpetuated in office, it is with the utmost pleasure that I say frankly, as a physician who has had much to do with the Commission and also an intimate knowledge of Mr. Brown personally, though he is a Democrat and I a Republican I have come to look upon the Commission as an ideal State department and Mr. Brown as a most competent official.

Mr. Brown is physically as well as mentally strong, and both are vitally necessary for the full and successful performance of duty. I am at present the resident member of the legislative committee of the New York State Medical Society, and hence have had much which has taken me into close relations with many of the departments.

Presenting my compliments, I have the honor to remain,

Very respectfully yours,
ARTHUR G. ROOT, M. D.

GILES S. PIPER,
Attorney and Counselor,
Fulton, N. Y.

December 7, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect, State of New York:

DEAR SIR.— I understand that the term of office of Mr. Goodwin Brown as State Commissioner in Lunacy will expire in a few months, and that it will become your duty, as Governor of the State, to appoint his successor.

Mr. Brown was an Oswego county boy, and we naturally take pride and a deep interest in him.

We know him to be a man of fine ability and great industry.

I have had enough to do with the Comission since its creation to know that there is no man in the State better qualified to fill the position than Mr. Brown.

He has been identified with the subject of State care of the insane since its inception, and by his persistent efforts and able arguments he overcame in a large measure the opposition to the system.

You could give no better satisfaction to the citizens of this county, members of all parties, than to appoint Mr. Brown as his own successor.

Very respectfully yours,
GILES S. PIPER.

November 25, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Oyster Bay, N. Y.:

MY DEAR SIR.— I have known the Hon. Goodwin Brown, of the State Commission in Lunacy, for about twenty years. I have been interested in the work of that Commission, and in the great progress made in this State through its initiative.

I have often talked with Mr. Brown, and have often examined their reports. He is a modest man, but I doubt if any individual is entitled to more credit than he for the good work done. His legal training adds to his natural capacity for such work.

I believe that such offices should be filled independent of political considerations, and that a man like Mr. Brown, who discharges the duties of his office with an eye single to their faithful performance, should be continued in well doing. No man has regretted trusting him with power, and I do not believe you can possibly regret continuing him in the place in which he has been tried and not found wanting. Such men of unquestioned integrity, character and ability are needed in just such positions in this State.

Very sincerely yours,
ADELBERT MOOT.

COLUMBIA NATIONAL BANK OF BUFFALO,
BUFFALO, November 22, 1898.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER.— Please excuse delay in answering yours of the 14th. Glad to hear from you. I regret to learn that your term of office expires May next. Would be glad to see a man, such as you, retained in office. My rule here in Buffalo, during my term of office as mayor, was to reappoint chiefs of departments without regard to politics who had served their city faithfully and honestly. I have great faith in our Governor-elect, Theodore Roosevelt, and wouldnot be surprised if he should follow the course such as mentioned.

Your public bath here is a great success, and I hope and pray that you will get through a bill compelling cities of the first and second class to erect and maintain public comfort stations.

With my best wishes for your success and reappointment, I have the honor to be,

Very truly yours,
EDGAR B. JEWETT.

To Commissioner GOODWIN BROWN,
State Commission in Lunacy, Albany, N. Y.

McMillan, Pooley, Depew & Spratt,
Counsellors at Law,
Ellicott Square, Buffalo.

November 19, 1898.

Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, Governor, etc., Albany, N. Y.:

Dear Sir.— It is with a great deal of pleasure that I commend to your favorable consideration the Honorable Goodwin Brown, for reappointment as State Commissioner in Lunacy.

I have known Mr. Brown personally for twenty years, both socially and professionally, and regard him as a man of sterling qualities. Moreover, since his appointment to the position which he now holds, I have watched with great interest the work which he has performed, and with all due respect to his associates, I venture to say that the present excellent condition of the affairs coming under the supervision of the State Commission in Lunacy is due in a very great measure to his personal efforts. As an executive officer, and as an organizer of departments, he is without a superior. He seems to be specially fitted for work of the kind which has engaged his attention now for several years, and it seems to me that the State and the proper and efficient conduct of this very important branch of the State service requires exactly such a man, and without flattery to you, I believe in his thoroughness and rooting qualities he is a man after your own stamp, and I could not therefore give him a higher recommendation. He is a Democrat, but under the circumstances I think that even this might be forgiven.

I most heartily wish and hope that he may be retained on the Commission.

Very respectfully yours,
Chas. A. Pooley.

New York State National Bank,
Albany, November 28, 1898.

Hon. Theodore Roosevelt:

Dear Sir.— Permit me to recommend to your consideration the reappointment of the Hon. Goodwin Brown as the legal member of the Lunacy Commission.

In his daily life in this city he has commended himself to his fellow-citizens as an upright man and faithful public servant. He has proved himself resourceful, suggestive, able and fearless in the discharge of his official duties.

Added to his record his familiarity with every detail of the State's care of the insane (much of the excellent system of which being due to his intelligent foresight and oversight) and his experience, the desirability of having a member of the Commission resident at the Capitol, will make his reappointment most appropriate and of special value to the public service.

Very respectfully,
Willis G. Nash,
Cashier.

THE NEW YORK MILLS.
W. S. Walcott, *President.*

New York Mills, Oneida County, N. Y.,
December 12, 1898.

Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, Albany, N. Y.:

Dear Sir.— I beg leave to express a hope that the Hon. Goodwin Brown may be retained in the position of Commissioner in Lunacy by receiving an appointment from you as Governor. It has been my pleasure to know well the workings of the Commission since it was first organized and to be well acquainted with Mr. Brown and his methods. I have had the honor of being a manager of the State Hospital at Utica for the past ten years, and I can bear testimony to the zeal and efficient services of the said Commissioner. He has proved his superior ability and taken a deep interest in the welfare of the insane, and to him more than to any other person is the uniformity and efficiency of the State care of the insane to be attributed. The reappointment of Mr. Brown to the office of Commissioner would, I think, give general satisfaction and continue the good work of the past.

Yours very respectfully,
W. S. Walcott,
President Board of Managers, Utica State Hospital.

---

202 Lark Street, Albany, N. Y.,
December 10, 1898.

Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, Governor-Elect:

Dear Sir.— I have been requested to write in favor of the candidacy for reappointment of Hon. Goodwin Brown, Commissioner in Lunacy. I presume the request arises from the fact that I was for several years in the medical service of the Utica, Willard and St. Lawrence State Hospitals.

Mr. Brown is one of the original members of the Lunacy Commission which was organized ten years ago to carry out the provision of the law requiring that the State should care for all of its insane dependents. The present system of management resulting from this law, is largely the creation of Mr. Brown's genius, and now seems to be working harmoniously and effectively. The interests involved are so large that any change would be perilous, and the scheme of control now in force should have full trial. The continuance of Mr. Brown in office would contribute to this end, and would also preserve the non-partisan character of the Commission.

I have the honor to be,

Very respectfully yours,
J. M. Mosher, M. D.

GREENPORT, L. I., December 15, 1898.

Hon. T. ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect:

SIR.— One of the most important acts of your administration will be the selection of a member of the State Lunacy Commission to succeed the present legal member, Hon. Goodwin Brown, whose term expires in May, 1899.

It is not important merely or mainly as affecting the individual who may be chosen, nor even as affecting the interests of the State and of its insane wards, great as those interests are and deeply involved in the exercise of your appointive power as they must be, but it is transcendently important in the sense that it tends to establish a State policy towards the State's maintenance of its self-assumed obligations to the dependent classes.

Briefly, the issue in this latter respect is whether or not partisan considerations shall be permitted to avail in the State's control and practical operation of its present system of caring for the insane. That system is an extensive and costly one, including in its scope many thousands of persons and requiring a yearly expenditure of four to five millions of dollars. From the time the present State Commission in Lunacy was established, in 1889, till now, one of the marked features of its action and one of the chief sources of such measure of success as it has accomplished has been its rigid exclusion of anything that could be construed into political influence over its control of the several institutions, public and private, subject to its direction. The determination to keep entirely aloof from partisanship or such sources as are commonly understood by the term "politics," was reached almost as soon as the Commission was organized, and has been consistently adhered to ever since, although its personnel has been twice changed, the medical and lay members originally appointed having been replaced by others. Nearly ten years have passed, during which time many millions of the State's money have been disbursed under the Commission's charge; and while there have been periods of sharp local controversy between it and officials of different institutions, and while awards of contracts have been closely scrutinized by disappointed bidders, not in a single instance, as far as I am aware, has there been any public scandal or any serious dispute over the honesty, impartiality and entire fairness of the Commission's action. If any allegation of partisan or political favoritism could have been successfully sustained, this pregnant fact would not be possible.

So much for the general bearing of the matter in hand upon one of the largest State affairs with which you will have to deal.

If it were merely a personal matter, I should be content with briefly expressing my confidence in and regard for the present legal member of the Commission and commending him to your favor; but in the light of what has been written, and of the further fact that during eight years of lay membership on the Commission I had constant official intercourse with Mr. Brown and daily opportunity to note the character and value of his services as its law adviser and as an active, alert, energetic, practically as well as theoretically informed and clear-sighted member, always thoughtful alike of the State's business interest and of the material and moral welfare of the insane (for such I found him and such I continued to know him), I deem it a duty, to you as well as to him, to say something more as to the two respects above referred to, which constitute Mr. Brown's rightful claim to be reappointed.

In his relation as the legal member, it is perfectly safe to say that no man in the State, living or dead, ever made so thorough a study or attained so complete a mastery of the facts and principles embodied in legislation concerning the insane, as has Mr. Brown. His familiarity with the entire body of law covering this special field equips him in a pre-eminent sense for the place he holds, and makes a continuance of that relation vitally useful to the State, to the Commission, and to individuals affected by legal questions frequently arising in so large and widely ramifying a system of administration.

As a member of the Commission, Mr. Brown has been and is a large factor in its effective performance of the varied duties devolved upon it by law. He has never been a laggard in its work, but always indefatigable, zealous, intelligent and earnest, sparing neither time nor effort to become practically acquainted with the conditions existing at the State hospitals and private asylums, and carefully seeking the best and most economical — not thereby meaning always the cheapest in first cost — measure of improvement and relief where needed. Furthermore, and foremost in real value as a qualification for efficient discharge of this particular function, Mr. Brown is a thoroughly honest man, not in a merely negative or ordinary sense, but positively and even aggressively so. This characteristic, while sometimes productive of temporary friction and displeasure, has been of the greatest importance to the State in the execution of the Commission's trust as the disburser of its money; and when time has been given for reflection the general wisdom and prudence of his course have vindicated themselves and expelled any resentment that might at first have been felt.

Therefore, for the two main reasons above outlined, I respectfully feel emboldened to say that Mr. Brown's reappointment is a duty you owe to the people of the State and to your own renown as its Governor.

First. You will thereby stamp ineffaceably on the established policy of non-partisan and non-political State care of the insane the seal of your official sanction.

Second. You will retain in the public service for six years a man fitted by special and general qualifications for the very best grade and quality of work which that service can require, and of whom it can be justly held that his past official record is the strongest possible guarantee of his future course.

I have the honor to be,

Respectfully yours,
HENRY A. REEVES.

EPISCOPAL RESIDENCE,
ALBANY, December 14, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect:

DEAR SIR.— I am familiar to some extent with the great work of administering the system of hospitals for the insane in this State and beg to say that the honesty, efficiency and executive skill shown by the present legal Commissioner, Goodwin Brown, not to mention his ten years' experience in this great department, should ensure his reappointment at your hands.

THOMAS M. A. BURKE,
Bp. Albany.

STATE OF NEW YORK.

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE,
ALBANY, December 13, 1898.

Col. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect:

DEAR COL. ROOSEVELT.— When the Lunacy Commission was organized, during the administration of Governor Hill, he appointed upon that Commission one Republican and two Democrats. The Commission has continued in that shape, with one Republican and two Democrats, down through Governor Flower's time and until Governor Morton had the power of appointment. Then the thing was reversed, and two Republicans and one Democrat constituted the board. The Democrat who was reappointed by Governor Flower, and who has served in the Commission from the time of its organization, is Goodwin Brown. I have known Mr. Brown for many years, first as a lawyer in Buffalo, then as pardon clerk appointed by Governor Cleveland, and latterly as a member of the Lunacy Commission. I believe him to be honest, painstaking, intelligent and an excellent public official. Should you determine to pursue the policy of continuing the board in its quasi non-partisan character, I do not think you could do better than retain the experience and ability of Mr. Brown.

Very truly yours,
JAMES A. ROBERTS.

December 10, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Oyster Bay, N. Y.:

MY DEAR SIR.— My interest in one of the greatest charities of the State prompts me to write you in regard to the reappointment of Mr. Goodwin Brown, the legal member of the State Commission in Lunacy, whose term is about to expire.

As you are undoubtedly aware, Mr. Brown has been connected with the Commission since its organization, and all who are familiar with its history and work know that its present state of efficiency has been brought about, almost wholly, by his zeal, ability and fearlessness of criticism in introducing and advocating measures to secure proper care of the insane, and a proper use of the State's funds.

Mr. Brown has devoted his entire time for the past nine years to the duties of his office, and I think I am correct in saying that his qualifications, integrity of character and deep interest in the welfare of the insane, have never been questioned.

My knowledge of the care of the insane, from an experience of nearly seventeen years in the service of the State, leads me to believe that the highest interests of both the insane and the State would be subserved by Mr. Brown's retention in office, and certainly his experience and training could not fail to make his reappointment meet with the approval of all who are in sympathy with the principles of civil service reform.

It is but just for me to say that this letter has been written without Mr. Brown's knowledge or suggestion and solely from the desire to see the system which has already placed New York far in advance of every other State in the Union, properly maintained and kept free from the dangers which, in some of the other States, surround the care of the unfortunate insane.

With assurances of deep respect, I am,

Very respectfully yours,
CHAS. W. PILGRIM.

STATE OF NEW YORK.

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE,
ALBANY, December 13, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect:

MY DEAR SIR.— I take pleasure in commending the services of Mr. Goodwin Brown, who has been one of the State Commission in Lunacy since the creation of said Commission in 1889. Mr. Brown was among the first to advocate the care of the insane by the State, and during his years of service has initiated and put in practice many reforms in perfecting a system for the care of these unfortunate people. In the discharge of his duties it has been necessary for him to consult and advise with this department as to financial matters, and we have always found him willing to adopt any suggestions which would improve and simplify the rendering and form of accounts for the State hospitals.

I sincerely trust you may favorably consider his name for reappointment at the expiration of his present term of office.

Very truly yours,
WILLIS E. MERRIMAN.

GALESBURG, ILLINOIS,
December 7, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, New York City, N. Y.:

MY DEAR SIR.— I have the honor to recommend to you for reappointment as a member of the State Commission in Lunacy, Goodwin Brown, Esq., whom it was my pleasure to know with some intimacy when I was Secretary of the New York State Charities Association. I know with what ardor and with what efficiency he labored for the State care of all the insane and know further that he has been fearless and honest in his advocacy of other reforms. While I have not been in touch with affairs in New York for several years, I have some reason to know from word that has come to me occasionally that Mr. Brown has been during these years both faithful and efficient in the service of the State. My own association with him in movements for the betterment of the conditions of the insane as well as in other reform measures, has given me confidence in his integrity and admiration for his fearless and staunch support of what he deemed right.

I am sir.

Yours very respectfully,
JOHN H. FINLEY.

THE MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS.
ALBANY AGENCY, W. F. WINSHIP, *Manager*.

ALBANY, N. Y., December 13, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect:

DEAR SIR.— Permit me to say a few words in behalf of Mr. Goodwin Brown, one of the members of the State Commission in Lunacy, whose term of office expires during the present winter.

Notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Brown and I belong to different political parties, it gives me pleasure, and I feel it a duty to say that I conscientiously and firmly believe that the interests of the State will be best subserved by his reappointment.

He is known to be a high-minded, honest official and, after years of strict devotion to duty and the constant application of true economic principles to every detail in his department, he brings to the State a hard-earned experience as valuable as it is varied.

It seems to me, therefore, that Mr. Brown's continuance in this important office would surely and naturally inure to the public good and be the means of saving to the State thousands of dollars every year, as well as maintaining the high standard of our State hospitals.

Respectfully yours,
W. F. WINSHIP.

---

24 SOUTH HAWK STREET.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Oyster Bay, L. I.:

DEAR SIR.— As an official examiner in lunacy for many years and lecturer on medical jurisprudence at the Albany Law School and Albany Medical College, I have had frequent opportunity to note the development of the State care of the insane adopted in 1890.

I believe the present efficiency of administration is, in a large measure, due to the careful and conscientious attention of Commissioner Brown to the work of the Commission.

I am sure that all who are acquainted with his services can truthfully testify to his honesty, zeal and fitness.

I earnestly hope that you may see it your duty to reappoint Mr. Brown.

Yours respectfully,
ANDREW MACFARLANE, M. D.

December 14, 1898.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
SENATE CHAMBER.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., December 15. 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect of the State of New York, Oyster Bay, N. Y.:

DEAR COL. ROOSEVELT.— During my term as State Senator, I have come to know Goodwin Brown, at present one of the State Commissioners in Lunacy, very well. I have not only had official relations with him, but have come to know a great deal about his humanitarian work in other directions, for example, his efforts to secure the establishment of free public baths in the cities and towns of this State. He was the author of the first general legislation ever enacted in this country — I may say the only legislation which provided for free public baths.

I have always found Mr. Brown capable, courteous and an intelligent public officer. For years he has given his whole time and attention to the duties of the office. He has been the author, either directly or indirectly, of most of the legislation during the past ten years affecting the insane. He is the author of a very large number of humanitarian statutes. He has given the best years of his life to the work of properly caring for the insane and improving public measures for the welfare of the people.

For many years prior to his appointment as a State Commissioner in Lunacy he had charge of the criminal business in the Executive Chamber, and especially the extradition of fugitives from justice. He was especially active during that period in procuring the enactment of wise and humane statutes relating to criminals and convicts. He is the author of the present extradition statutes of New York, and was the delegate appointed by the Governor of New York to meet with delegates from the various States and territories to revise and codify the extradition laws of the country.

During his term as Commissioner, he has been the active, untiring and zealous member of that body, and to him, perhaps more than to any other man, is due the successful inauguration of the movement for State care of the insane. I think an examination will show that the present admirable financial system has been almost entirely worked out by him. The State Commission in Lunacy is regarded, and is freely said to be the best organized department in the State government. Although I am, as you know, a Republican in politics, and have always been loyal to the best interests of the Republican party, I am constrained to say that I think it would be to the interest of the State service that Mr. Brown should be reappointed. The State Commission in Lunacy was originally organized as a non-partisan body, and a life-long Republican was placed at its head. The Commission, up to the time of the appointment of the Hon. William L. Parkhurst, was composed of two Democrats and one Republican; with Mr. Parkhurst, it now stands two Republicans and one Democrat. I believe that this non-partisan policy should continue. It would not be wise to place the entire responsibility of so great an organization in the hands of one party, and I think the charge of partisanship would be brought against any party which insisted on filling the Commission entirely with members of its own organization.

Trusting that you will not regard my communication as obtrusive, or as dictated by any other motive than of sincere desire to serve the best interests of the State.

Believe me, I am,
Yours with the highest respect,
C. R. PARSONS.

STONE, GANNON & PETIT,
Attorneys and Counselors-at-Law,
SYRACUSE, N. Y.

To the Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect:

I take pleasure in commending to your favorable consideration the name of Hon. Goodwin Brown for appointment as a member of the State Commission in Lunacy. His experience in the work of this Commission, I believe, would be of large value to the State. Since its organization he has borne an active and honorable and efficient part in the development of the State care for the insane. I know of no Democrat whose appointment would be more creditable.

With great respect, I have the honor to remain,

Very truly yours,
CHARLES L. STONE.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., December 12, 1898.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

DEPARTMENT OF RHETORIC AND PUBLIC SPEAKING.
RALPH WILMER THOMAS.

HAMILTON, N. Y., December 15, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor of the State of New York:

DEAR SIR.— The term of office of Hon. GoodwinBrown, as a member of the State Commission in Lunacy. expires on May 15, 1899.

Permit me to indorse a request for his reappointment to the Commission for the following reasons:

First. A personal acquaintance of about ten years' standing justifies the statement that Mr. Brown has the necessary ability to fill the position. and the character necessary to justify his appointment.

Second. During the earlier years of the Commission's existence, I had the opportunity of becoming familiar with Mr. Brown's work, and ever since leaving Albany I have known more or less about his services as Commissioner. I believe that the amount and nature of those services, to say nothing of the experience he has so gained, would justify his appointment.

This Commission has always been a non-partisan body, both parties having been represented; Mr. Brown, being a Democrat, will continue the minority representation.

With your declaration that you will appoint no man to office who is not "as clean as a hound's tooth," as a Republican and as a citizen, I am in hearty accord; and in the spirit of that declaration, I respectfully commend to your favorable consideration the name of Goodwin Brown for appointment as a member of the State Commission in Lunacy.

Respectfully,
RALPH WILMER THOMAS.

CANANDAIGUA, N. Y., December 19, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect, Oyster Bay, N. Y.:

MY DEAR SIR.— You are, of course, aware of the fact that the term of Mr. Goodwin Brown, the legal member of the Lunacy Commission, expires on the 15th of May, 1899. In view of this fact I take the liberty of calling your attention to several considerations in relation to Commissioner Brown and the matter of the appointment of his successor, and I do so believing that you will not misunderstand my motives, but will appreciate the spirit in which the same are offered.

Being a Republican, it is unnecessary for me to say that I prefer to see the appointment of Republicans to office; but if, as I have been informed, the complexion of the Lunacy Commission is likely to remain non-political, the membership being composed of two Republicans and one Democrat, I desire to urge the advisability of retaining Commissioner Brown. I do not know that you are familiar with Mr. Brown's qualifications, but, in any event, I desire to say that in my judgment, and basing my views upon knowledge gained during my incumbency, there is not in the State a man more competent to perform the duties of the office than is Mr. Brown. I do not refer simply to qualifications which come through long and active experience, but also to the exceptional ability possessed by Commissioner Brown, and the faithful, painstaking work which he has done in the discharge of his duties. I do not believe that there is in New York a more competent, honest and active State official than he.

I might enumerate. in detail, my reasons for believing that no change should be made in the Commission, but it would be superfluous. What I have said will suffice to show you my convictions upon the subject, although I shall hope for an opportunity to discuss the matter with you personally at some early date, at which time I can more comprehensively express my views.

I may add, with propriety, that Commissioner Wise fully shares my views in this matter.

I remain,
Resp'y your obd't servant,
W. L. PARKHURST.

(Dictated.)

32 NASSAU STREET,
NEW YORK CITY, December 16, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect of the State of New York:

DEAR SIR.— My object in writing is to urge the reappointment or continuation in office of Hon. Goodwin Brown as one of the State Commissioners in Lunacy.

By way of introducing myself, and to show my personal knowledge of Mr. Brown's work and abilities, I was legal adviser of Governor Hill and of Governor Flower, and a Commissioner of Statutory Revision from 1889 to 1895, and was also during the same period a professor of law in Cornell University Law School. When I began service in the Executive Chamber at Albany, Mr. Brown was pardon and extradition clerk there. In those days I was devoting a good deal of study and thought to the treatment of the insane and criminals and kindred topics. At Senator Fassett's request, I drafted for him the revision of the prison laws, known as the Fassett prison bill, in 1889. I had main charge of drafting the proposed revision of the Insanity Law. In the course of that work the Revision Commission had many conferences with the superintendents of the State hospitals, the Commissioners in Lunacy and legislative committees for two or three years, although the bill was not actually passed until after I ceased to be a Commissioner of Statutory Revision. So much as to myself.

As to the subject-matter of this letter, I beg leave to urge the reappointment of Mr. Brown on two independent grounds; first, because it would be equivalent to an announcement of your intention to preserve the non-partisan character of the Commission; second, because of Mr. Brown's personal experience and qualifications.

First. As to Preserving the Non-Partisan Character of the Commission.

Ever since the first establishment of the office of State Commissioners in Lunacy during Governor Hill's administration, the Commission has been non-partisan in form, that is to say, each of the two leading political parties has been represented on the Commission. Moreover, the Commission has been non-partisan in fact, that is to say, the Commissioners, from the outset, have set their faces firmly against the entrance of partisan influences into the administration of their office. For the purpose of keeping out such influences the original Commissioners, Dr. MacDonald and Messrs. Brown and Reeves, as early as 1890 requested Governor Hill to place the hospital superintendents and resident officers, including physicians, stewards and matrons, on the competitive list. Governor Hill hesitated to comply with the request, but after a delay of several months, being influenced largely by frequent and urgent arguments of Mr. Brown, Governor Hill acceded to their request, and the Commission was relieved from the pressure, which had already made itself felt, to yield to political pulls in making appointments and in otherwise administering their office. From the time of his appointment as one of the original Commissioners, Mr. Brown has been one of the most steadfast and obstinate adherents to the policy of administering the office on business principles as opposed to partisan considerations, and I think it is safe to say that no charge of undue partisanship has ever been made, or can justly be made against any member of the Commission from 1889 to date.

It was the unwritten law of the Governor of the State during my connection with the Executive Chamber that in all similar commissions both political parties should be represented. This policy was steadily adhered to by Governor Hill and Governor Flower, and it is respectfully submitted that the policy should not be departed from by a Republican Governor. In the case of the Statutory Revision Commission, I was a pronounced Republican at the time Governor Hill appointed me, and continued such until after my last reappointment by Governor Flower, when I yielded to the influences of my environment and became and since have been a Democrat. On the accession of Governor Morton I retired from office, and have since been practicing law and keeping out of politics. The same non-partisan policy was pursued in the matter of appointments to the membership of the State Board of Health, State Board of Charities, boards of managers of State hospitals and other charitable institutions, as well as in the State Commission in Lunacy.

I recognize fully that a non-partisan commission may easily become a bi-partisan commission, but up to the present time this has not been the case with State boards. The representation of both political parties in the Lunacy Commission and in the other State commissions and boards has had the effect of giving them non-partisan character. A change in the system now would necessarily be accepted as an announcement that under your administration the non-partisan character of such boards and commissions should cease, and that they should be administered on partisan principles.

For reasonings suggested briefly above, I consider the preservation of the non-partisan character of the Commission as more important to the State, than the personal character, fitness and ability of any one person to fill the office.

Second. As to Mr. Brown's Personal Qualifications and Fitness for the Work.

Mr. Brown is obstinately honest. No one would dare to suggest to him a corrupt proposition; so far as I know no one has ever charged him with corrupt motive or conduct, and I am absolutely certain that no such charge could justly be made.

I was in close personal relations with him during the early days of the Commission, and in frequent consultations with the Commission as to their legal rights and duties under the laws as they existed; and as to the amendments made to the statutes relating to the insane, prior to the passage of the Insanity Law in 1896. In bringing the State hospitals under a uniform system, the Commission necessarily antagonized more or less the local administrations of the several State hospitals. The Commissioners had many sharp controversies with local boards and superintendents before the Commissioners of Statutory Revision. Mr. Brown by nature is firm, positive and somewhat aggressive. It was due to his firmness that the management of the State hospitals was brought under the present system of uniformity. The economies and improvements which have been effected by the new system, which began with the establishment of the office of the Commissioners in Lunacy in 1889, can hardly be exaggerated, and this is no occasion for attempting to present the subject in any detail. Mr. Brown was the executive organizer of the new financial system, and in fact was the chief organizer of the entire administration of the office of the State Commission in

Lunacy. He has proven that he has a genius for organization. No State office is more thoroughly systematized. No member of the Commission is so thoroughly acquainted with the details of the system and with the details of the work, and no member of the Commission ever has been so thoroughly acquainted with such matters as Mr. Brown. In addition to all this, many nice and difficult questions have arisen and will continue to arise over such questions as legality of confinement, liability for injuries and for support of patients, with which no person in the State is so familiar as Mr. Brown, by reason of the fact that he has been instrumental in drafting nearly all of the legislation now on the statute books on this subject, and that he has had main charge of administering the legal side of such legislation. It would take another lawyer, however able and generally qualified, a period of years to gain the special knowledge in these lines which Mr. Brown now possesses. I could say much more to the same general effect, but hesitate to do so, for fear I shall seem to exaggerate.

I trust you will be able to believe me when I say that, without prejudice from personal and political considerations, I should consider it a great misfortune to the State to lose the services of Mr. Brown from the State Commission in Lunacy.

I started out to write this letter to you without consulting Mr. Brown, but afterward thought it was hardly fair to him to write you without his knowledge and consent, inasmuch as I have no personal or political reason for addressing you. I have accordingly sent Mr. Brown a copy of this letter and it is sent to you with his consent.

Very respectfully yours,

CHAS. A. COLLIN.

SENATE CHAMBER.

ALBANY, December 27, 1898.

No. 32 Nassau Street, New York City.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Albany, New York:

MY DEAR GOVERNOR.—I understand that Mr. Goodwin Brown, of the State Commission in Lunacy, is a candidate for reappointment. I have had occasion to know Mr. Brown in connection with legislation relating to the lunacy and kindred subjects for the past four years. My acquaintance has covered his appearances before committees of which I was a member and many personal conversations and interviews. He has always impressed me by his knowledge of the subject in which he was interested and by his faithful and careful consideration of all details relating to them. I feel that I can cordially commend him to your favorable consideration in the matter of his reappointment.

Yours very truly,

FRANK D. PAVEY.

1168 DELAWARE AVENUE,

BUFFALO, NEW YORK,

December 20, 1898.

MY DEAR SIR.— The term of office of Mr. Goodwin Brown, as a member of the State Commission in Lunacy, expires in May next, and I very earnestly urge upon you his reappointment. I knew Mr. Brown before he was made a member of the Commission in the first instance, and I was so impressed with his fitness for the place at that time that I felt his appointment was a distinct gain to the public service. Since then I have watched quite closely the operations of the Commission and know how thoroughly and ably Mr. Brown has performed his duties as a Commissioner. He had to begin with special qualifications for the place, and they have been matured and developed by his long service in the office. I cannot help thinking that to substitute some one else for him would be a great detriment to the work of the Commission, because of his intimate acquaintance with it, his unusual experience and his devotion to it. In pressing his reappointment upon you, though he is a Democrat, because of his fitness and loyal service in the past, I feel that I am putting it on grounds which have your hearty sympathy and support. Believe me,

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN G. MILBURN.

HON. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect.

NO. 127 MONROE STREET,

TIFFIN, OHIO,

December 20, 1898.

His Excellency, GOVERNOR ROOSEVELT, Albany, N. Y.:

DEAR SIR.— Permit me to call your attention to the splendid work accomplished by Hon. Goodwin Brown in the Lunacy Commission of your State, and to ask that he may be continued in a work for which he has proven himself to be so specially qualified. I have intimately known Mr. Brown for many years and have watched his work in lunacy with ever-increasing interest and admiration. He is as thoroughly devoted to that work, and as intelligent concerning it as any man could possibly be.

For many years I was a citizen of your State and still retain a lively interest in its welfare. I am an ardent Republican and rejoiced greatly upon your election, but I believe that you could not possibly find a better man for the position Mr. Brown holds than himself, and, though he is a Democrat, you will find him very loyal to your administration as well as a most capable official.

I am pastor of a Presbyterian church of this city and can easily furnish whatever testimonials you may need as to my standing.

Very truly yours,

JAS. P. S. STRATTAN.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,
JUDGES' CHAMBERS.
BROOKLYN, N. Y., December 17, 1898.

MY DEAR SIR.— Since my legislative days I have known Mr. Goodwin Brown, now for a number of years a Commissioner in Lunacy, and venture to write you concerning him.

Upon occasionally meeting Mr. Brown during a few years last past, I have noticed that he seemed sincerely interested in the affairs pertaining to his office, and that he was concerned in the selection and use of the best modern thought on the subject of the care of the insane, and I think that a person who has made a study of public matters committed to him should be continued in position.

In surveying the progress of affairs in this State during the last twenty years, advance seems to have been made in any particular department, because some one has made a hobby of the subject-matter, and I believe that Mr. Brown bears that relation to the Commission in Lunacy, and hence write you in his behalf.

I remain,
Very truly yours,
EDWARD B. THOMAS.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Albany, N. Y.

SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK.
BUFFALO, N. Y., December 23, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Oyster Bay, N. Y.:

DEAR SIR.— I write to briefly express my views upon the subject of the appointment of a State Commissioner in Lunacy to succeed Mr. Goodwin Brown. I have had occasion in several ways to become familiar with the work of Mr. Brown upon this Commission. I think few public officials have brought to bear in the performance of their duty so much intelligent effort and so much executive capacity. Hard, faithful and diligent work has characterized his management from the time of his appointment, and it has been due in no slight degree to his untiring efforts that the Commission has been brought to its present state of efficiency. Our State Commission in Lunacy is one of the best managed boards in this or any other country. The work of the Commission has been organized and systematized in a way to bring about the best results, and those results have been much greater economy in the management of the various institutions in their charge, more efficient service and a better care in almost every respect for the insane patients.

While I am opposed to Mr. Brown in politics, I believe his services have been of so great value to the State and that it would be so largely to the public interests to retain his services that political considerations are of little account in comparison.

I remain,
Very respectfully yours,
GEORGE H. THORNTON.

PROVIDENCE RETREAT,
BUFFALO, N. Y., December 22, 1898.

Col. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Oyster Bay, N. Y.:

DEAR SIR.— I write to inform you of the high esteem in which Mr. Brown is held by me. Although he has been of an opposite political faith and one who has certainly criticised our institution at times severely, I believe he has always acted in good faith and with the sense of doing his duty without fear or favor.

I must acknowledge the newly-organized Commission in Lunacy of New York State has become an example for other States and countries to follow, and it is my wish, not only as a citizen, but one who has had experience in the State hospital service previous to the formation of this Commission, that we will be able to keep so powerful a body free from political influences.

I desire to express my unqualified faith in your future administration. I am,
Respectfully yours,
HARRY A. WOOD,
Physician in Charge.

DR. A. VANDER VEER,
Office 28 Eagle Street.

ALBANY, N. Y., December 20, 1898.

MY DEAR COL. ROOSEVELT.— Permit me to present the name of Mr. Goodwin Brown for reappointment as one of the Commissioners in Lunacy. Although he is not of our political faith, yet I know of his work and can vouch for his having discharged his duties in a thoroughly honest, upright manner. I am sure it will please many of his friends to see him reappointed.

Pardon my intrusion, and believe me,
Faithfully and sincerely yours,
A. VANDER VEER.

Col. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Addressed.

STATE BOARD OF PHARMACY OF NEW YORK,
ALBANY, N. Y., December 17, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT:

DEAR SIR.— I have been acquainted with the work of Goodwin Brown during his service as member of the State Commission in Lunacy, and believe that it has been honest, economical and efficient.

I feel sure that the needs of the Commission and the interests of the State will receive careful and able consideration if he is continued in office.

Very respectfully,
ALFRED B. HUESTED.

CUTHBERT W. POUND,
College of Law,
Cornell University.

ITHACA, N. Y., December 28, 1898.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor-Elect:

DEAR SIR.— I take the liberty of addressing you in behalf of Hon. Goodwin Brown, of the State Commission in Lunacy, whose term of office is about to expire. I have known Mr. Brown and had some knowledge of his work as Commissioner for the past five years. To him is very largely due the present efficiency of the Commission. He has been energetic and efficient, intelligent and laborious in the performance of his duties. So far as I have observed, he has worked with an eye single to the interests of the State and its unfortunate patients in the State Hospitals. The records of the Commission show what he has accomplished.

If there is any office in which an efficient Democrat should be retained this is it — and if any Democrat is worthy of retention for the welfare of the State, Mr. Brown is the man. It seems to me that partisan considerations alone should not outweigh his experience and qualifications.

Yours respectfully,
CUTHBERT W. POUND.

---

111 State Street,
Albany, N. Y.

January 4, 1899.

Honorable THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Executive Chamber, Albany, New York:

SIR.— In May coming, you will be called upon to appoint a successor to Lunacy Commissioner Brown. I am in hopes you will see your way clear to reappoint Mr. Brown. He has made an ideal record, and the Commission on which he is a member is a credit to the State.

As a former member of the State Board of Health, official matters from time to time, brought me in personal contact with Mr. Brown and I learned to respect his good judgment, ability and interest in his work. He is the stamp of man I believe it will be your desire to recognize. I am satisfied that before making such an important appointment you will give same careful consideration. Mr. Brown's record in the past is a guarantee for the future.

I address you this letter, believing in honest and capable public service; speaking for one who has been an honest and capable public servant.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Yours very respectfully,
W. E. MILBANK.

STATE OF NEW YORK — BINGHAMTON STATE HOSPITAL.

CHARLES G. WAGNER, M. D.,
Medical Superintendent.

January 6, 1899.

Honorable THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor, Albany, N. Y.:

DEAR SIR.— I beg to add to the many testimonials which I know you have already received, a word or two on behalf of Goodwin Brown, Esq., whose term of office as State Commissioner in Lunacy is about to expire.

I have known Mr. Brown intimately during the ten years he has served as a Commissioner in Lunacy and gladly bear testimony to his unswerving fidelity and to his zeal and industry in promoting the interests of the insane and at the same time endeavoring to secure an efficient and economical administration of all the affairs of the State hospital service. Mr. Brown's intimate knowledge of the needs of the several institutions for the care of the insane, gained from long experience, and his unquestioned integrity, together with unusual aptitude for systematic organization, constitute the strongest possible arguments for his retention in office.

This letter, allow me to add, is written without Mr. Brown's knowledge and is prompted only by an earnest desire for the continued success of an admirable system, for the building up of which he has been chiefly responsible.

With my warmest congratulations to you on the auspicious commencement of the duties of your great office, and with highest respect and esteem, I remain,

Your obedient servant,
CHARLES G. WAGNER.

GEORGE EMERSON BREWER, M. D.,
68 West Forty-sixth st., New York.

December 23, 1898.

To the Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor of the State of New York:

MY DEAR SIR.— It gives me great pleasure to endorse the candidacy of Mr. Goodwin Brown — who is an applicant for reappointment on the State Commission in Lunacy. I have known Mr. Brown for a number of years and am familiar with the many changes which he has been able to effect in the management of the State asylums.

Mr. Brown has given the same care and energy to the affairs of his department, under several administrations — and apparently without any thought of partianship — and altho' he is a Democrat — I am sure that many Republicans like myself would be pleased at his appointment.

Very truly,
G. E. BREWER.

Law Office of Frank B. Lown,
54 Market st.,
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y., January 5, 1899.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor State of New York:

MY DEAR SIR.— I have been a member of the Board of Managers of the Hudson River State Hospital for many years, and for several years have been the president of the board. As a member of this board, I desire most respectfully to urge upon you the propriety of the reappointment of Mr. Goodwin Brown as one of the State Commissioners in Lunacy to succeed himself.

I have known Mr. Brown, officially and personally, ever since his appointment, and perhaps have had as good an opportunity to judge of his character, ability and attainments as any man occupying the position I do would have. The Hudson River State Hospital, being situated midway between Albany and New York, I perhaps have seen more of Mr. Brown at this institution than I otherwise should have done — it being convenient of access. In this way I have come to know Mr. Brown very intimately, and have had an unusual opportunity to study his character and fitness for his position.

The matter of his reappointment to me is not a personal matter at all. It is simply a question of what is for the best interests of the State. He certainly has had a long experience, and has given his entire time to the duties of his office since the formation of the Commission, in 1889, and I can truthfully vouch for the fact that at all times he has been unremitting in his attention to his duties. He has shown courage and ability at all times, and has never hesitated to freely oppose anything which he believed to be against the interests of the State, even at times when I thought that a more cautious man might have made more friends by pursuing a more conciliatory and less positive course. His value in this Commission I consider to be of the first order, and it is a matter for you to consider whether it is for the State's best interests to have him replaced by an inexperienced man, no matter how honest or how capable.

I never have heard Mr. Brown's honesty impugned in the slightest degree, and I am sure that this charge could not be successfully brought against him. It is altogether likely that he has made enemies in the discharge of his duties — I think this is the result more of manner than of deliberate intention. To some persons he might at times appear brusque and inconsiderate, but behind all this I believe him to be eminently fair and just, with an honest endeavor to be considerate to everyone with whom he is brought in contact.

During the whole of his term of service he has, in addition to doing his own work, I may say, taken the leading oar in the work of the Commission. His training, characteristics and habits would necessarily bring him to the front, and it is perhaps for this reason that acts of the Commission which might have been honestly questioned or disapproved of have been perhaps wholly laid to him, when perhaps the responsibility should have been shared.

There is another consideration I might urge, namely, that the board should continue of a quasi non-partisan character. From its organization both parties have been represented; the first president of the Commission, Dr. Carlos F. MacDonald, was a lifelong Republican. With the retirement of Mr. Reeves two years ago, a Republican was put in his place, so that the Commission now stands two Republicans and one Democrat.

Commissioner Brown, while he is known as a Democrat, I am sure has never been actively identified with politics and has never been known as an extreme partisan. In fact, his whole career shows him to have been wholly indifferent to partisan considerations. Certainly this charge cannot be brought against him.

If you can see your way clear to reappoint him, I am sure it would be for the public interest.

I am, yours with the highest respect,
FRANK B. LOWN.

GEORGE E. GORHAM, M. D.,
160 Hamilton St.

ALBANY, N. Y., Jan. 26, 1899.

Hon. THEO. ROOSEVELT, Governor:

DEAR SIR.— Being familiar with the efficient work done by Mr Goodwin Brown in the Lunacy Commission, I take the liberty to say that I hope you may see your way clear to re-appoint him. To his energy, foresight and faithfulness the Commission is indebted to-day, for much of its excellent and effective work, and I believe the interest of the State and of the insane will be well subserved by his re-appointment.

Yours very truly,
GEO. E. GORHAM.

STATE OF NEW YORK.

SUPREME COURT CHAMBERS.
Elmira.

January 11, 1899.

WALTER LLOYD SMITH.

To the GOVERNOR:

MY DEAR SIR.— If the State Commission is non-partisan, I should be glad to commend to your consideration the name of Goodwin Brown, already a member of the board. I think the opinion is universal that Mr. Brown has made an acceptable member of the board and a most efficient Commissioner.

Very respectfully,
WALTER LLOYD SMITH.

(Dictated to S.)

CHARLES J. BUCHANAN,
Counsellor at Law,
Albany, N. Y.

January 19, 1899.

DEAR SIR.— Assuming that the Lunacy Commission is to remain non-partisan in composition, I cordially recommend Mr. Goodwin Brown for reappointment as one of the commissioners thereof. I have known Mr. Brown well and favorably for many years, and believe that he has done more to build up and make successful the present lunacy system of the State than any other person, and all other persons. Mr. Brown is a gentleman, and both his competency and fitness for the position suggested are unquestioned. Although I am a Republican in politics, I cheerfully make this recommendation, and think that the continuance of Mr. Brown in office will be of benefit and advantage to the State.

Very respectfully,
CHARLES J. BUCHANAN.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Governor of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y.

HEADQUARTERS 203D REGIMENT, N. Y. V., I.
Camp "Wetherill," Greenville, S. C.

January 24, 1899.

Honorable THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor State of New York, Albany, N. Y.:

MY DEAR GOVERNOR ROOSEVELT.— Some little time ago I wrote you about Mr. Goodwin Brown, one of the State Commission in Lunacy.

While I did not have an opportunity to follow in detail the work which Mr. Brown did, I saw enough of him when I was in Albany to know how earnestly and conscientiously he performed the duties of his office, and it is a pleasure to me, entirely unsolicited by him, to supplement my previous letter with these few words.

Very sincerely yours,
WM. CARY SANGER,
Lieut-Colonel, 203d Regiment, N. Y. V., I.

STATE OF NEW YORK — WILLARD STATE HOSPITAL.

S. H. HAMMOND,
President Board of Managers.

GENEVA, February 4, 1899.

His Excellency, Governor ROOSEVELT:

DEAR SIR.— I desire to add my testimony to the efficiency and valuable services of Mr. Goodwin Brown of the Lunacy Commission and to ask, in the public interest, that he be retained in the position he so ably and laboriously fills.

Having been connected with Willard State Hospital as a member of the Board of Trustees during all the time of the incumbency of Mr. Brown as Commissioner, I have been cognizant of the growth of the admirable plan of supervision of hospital management which his untiring industry and devotion—intelligent and practicable — to the needs of the vast charity have systematized and developed and I feel competent to estimate in great measure, its value to the State. I say this without under estimating the co-operation of his colleagues in the Commission, who will, I feel confident, confirm all I say in this regard.

In considering his case, I have no doubt opposition, more or less intelligent, will develop, but, I venture to say, the motive will not be hard to find. He has pursued a *steady* course in his endeavors to engraft an ideal system of hospital management under the fostering care of the State. In doing this, changes had to be made — system, accountability, and harmonious action were made to take the place of loose methods of administration. Of course antagonisms were inevitable — either from lack of information or misconception of purpose — hence opposition — some *scars* perhaps remain.

Of course all this will readily occur to you, and I need not add more than to respectfully solicit your attention to the *model* public hospital system of the State, as evidence sustaining the suggestions I have made.

I feel very confident that the absence of Mr. Brown from the Commission would be a serious detriment to this branch of the public service.

I am, my dear sir,

Very respectfully yours,
S. H. HAMMOND.

MATTEAWAN STATE HOSPITAL.

FISHKILL LANDING, January 7, 1899.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor of the State of New York:

SIR.— The official relation of the Matteawan State Hospital to the State Commission in Lunacy has given me opportunities for observing the work of Goodwin Brown, State Commissioner in Lunacy, not only in connection with this hospital, but also in matters of lunacy relating to the State in general.

He has done much to consolidate and systematize a vast amount of detail work, which has resulted in uniform methods of administration in the various State hospitals. His intimate acquaintance with the work and his familiarity with all the phases and aspects of State care, acquired as a result of his experience from official visitations while the old county system was in vogue, together with his knowledge of and participation in subsequent legislation and its attendant results, in which he has been a prominent factor, render him a valuable member of the Lunacy Board, and should weigh largely in favor of his reappointment as Commissioner in Lunacy upon the expiration of his term.

Very respectfully,
H. E. ALLISON,
Medical Superintendent.

Supreme Court Chambers.
W. E. SCRIPTURE,
J. S. C.

ROME, N. Y., Feb. 1, 1899.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT:

DEAR GOVERNOR.— I desire to say a few words in behalf of Goodwin Brown, at present one of the Lunacy Commissioners

If the Commission is to remain non-partisan from what I know of the gentleman and his acts while on that Commission, I sincerely believe that his re-appointment would reflect credit on the appointing power.

In my judgment he is thoroughly honest, and in every way capable of discharging the duties of that responsible position.

Your friend,
W. E. SCRIPTURE.

Law Offices
GEORGE C. AUSTIN,
192 Broadway.

NEW YORK, November 22, 1898.

Honorable THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor of the State of New York, Oyster Bay, N. Y.:

MY DEAR SIR.— I have been the attorney for the State Commission in Lunacy in the county of New York since May, 1896, during which period I have frequently come into contact with Honorable Goodwin Brown, one of the commissioners, and whose term of office is to shortly expire. I have also visited the department at Albany a number of times for the purpose of conferring with Commissioner Brown and to receive instructions from him in relation to the matters in my charge, and during my service in the Assembly of 1896 and 1897 I had occasion to frequently go to the department not only for the purpose of attending to requests made by constituents, but for the purpose of getting necessary information for purposes of legislation.

The political complexion of the Commission is now two Republicans and one Democrat — Commissioner Brown being the latter. If the Commission is to be continued on the non-partisan basis, I would respectfully state that, in my opinion, Commissioner Brown deserves a reappointment for the invaluable work he has performed for the State. My judgment is based on personal knowledge of this work. Its value to the State simply cannot be overestimated. It affords me much personal pleasure to give this testimony in favor of Commissioner Brown, but he is justly entitled to all the commendation that can be given to him, because he is to-day one of the most competent and faithful public servants at Albany.

I beg to remain,

Yours very respectfully,
GEORGE C. AUSTIN.

STATE OF NEW YORK.

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER.

ALBANY, January 23, 1899.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor, Executive Chamber, Albany, N. Y.:

MY DEAR SIR.— In regard to the appointment of a Commissioner in Lunacy to succeed Goodwin Brown, whose term of office expires on April 19th of this year, as it seems to be generally understood that the Democratic representation on this board will be continued, and properly so as a matter of fairness, I desire to convey to you the wishes of many of my constituents that Mr. Brown be reappointed. I find that Mr. Brown has established a reputation as an able and conscientious official, administering the duties of his office without favoritism, and looking after the interests of the State with good judgment, avoiding both the penny-wise and the pound-foolish extremes, and that his record fully justifies the desire of his friends that he be continued in office. I therefore have pleasure in recommending his reappointment.

Very truly yours,
W. L. COUGHTRY,
1st Dist., Albany Co.

ALBANY, N. Y., February 14, 1899.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor:

Without doubt you receive from many citizens recommendations of persons for appointment to public office. It is their province to recommend, if they are so disposed, and you to give to them such weight as in your judgment they are entitled to.

We understand that for the appointment of Commissioner in Lunacy to the place now held by Goodwin Brown, some person not of Republican, but of Democratic, faith is to be considered. That being so, we most respectfully ask your favorable consideration of the reappointment of Mr. Brown. We do this because we have confidence in his ability and determination properly to administer the duties of the office. We know he has been a faithful public servant; that under the administration with which he has been connected there has been a great improvement in the management of the State institutions for the care of the insane; that there has been a reduction in the per capita cost of maintenance; an increased percentage of recoveries; an abandonment of the extravagant methods of construction, so far as construction is controlled by the Commission, and an adoption of systematic methods of administration greatly to the advantage of the State. To his work he has devoted the best years of his life, with a zeal and faithfulness which merit recognition. Though continually called upon to antagonize the ideas of individuals and boards of managers, anxious chiefly for the aggrandizement of their particular institution, he has deserved and received their respect and confidence, and no scandal has been connected with his private or official acts. For these and other reasons, we earnestly recommend his reappointment.

NATHANIEL A. ELSBERG.	JOHN FORD.
HENRY S. AMBLER.	WILLIAM L. THORNTON.
HOBART KRUM.	GEORGE CHAHOON.
GEORGE R. MALBY.	JAMES D. FEETER.
HENRY J. COGGESHALL.	NEVADA N. STRANAHAN.
WILLIAM E. JOHNSON.	BENJAMIN MARTIN WILCOX.
CHARLES T. WILLIS.	FRANKLIN D. SHERWOOD.
JOHN RAINES.	CORNELIUS R. PARSONS.
WILLIAM W. ARMSTRONG.	TIMOTHY E. ELLSWORTH.

GEORGE ALLEN DAVIS.

THE SECOND NATIONAL BANK.

OSWEGO, N. Y., March 18, 1899.

DEAR MR. MACDONALD.— I hope my letter will not be so intrusive as to be unwelcome. I fancy, however, that it will be a surprise, and if I did not know that you are one of the men above suspecting your fellow-men of acting only from selfish motives, I would hesitate to address you.

I say this because in point of fact there might be some reason for assuming that "circumstantial evidence" in this particular case could be construed as pointing toward me, as a "suspect."

The plain, unvarnished truth, however, is that the inspiration of this letter is a call made upon me by two personal friends of Commissioner Goodwin Brown, who have just left my office, one of them Supreme Court Justice Maurice L. Wright, and the other Recorder Charles N. Bulger.

They were here to ask me if, in my judgment, anything more can be done in behalf of Mr. Brown to induce the Governor to reappoint him. You will remember that Mr. Brown is an Oswego county boy, and those who grew up with him are taking a lively interest in his candidacy. Believing myself, with some opportunities of knowing, that Mr. Brown has been a good officer, and, as I believe, possessed of certain characteristics especially calculated to promote good government in our State hospitals, and also believing that no new man can render as useful service to the State as he can, I have done what I could to influence the Governor in his favor.

I can think of nothing more that lies within my power to do, or to try to do, to accomplish the end sought, and yet it has occurred to me that I might render a service by a suggestion to you. It has seemed to me that within the circle of your large acquaintance with influential men, and your possible knowledge of what the opposing influences operating on the Governor's mind are, that something through friends of yours, that your fertile mind might originate, could be used to produce effects at this time, which Mr. Brown's friends consider critical.

It seems to me, indeed, that the Governor should heed your advice alone, since you have a more comprehensive knowledge of the whole system of treating the insane in this State than anybody that I know of, and that, also, you know better than anybody else Mr. Brown's qualifications for such work. I am writing, therefore, under a strong impression that just at this stage, while the Governor's mind is balancing so evenly, a word from you might just turn the scale in Mr. Brown's favor.

Let me say, I would not presume to make a suggestion to you on this subject had I not learned that you were already and from the first have favored Mr. Brown's reappointment, and let me say, in the same connection, that I do not offer my judgment in opposition to yours, because I shall bow to any conclusion you may reach as to what more, if anything, can be done, as the wiser one, whatever it may be.

Trusting that the world is letting you have your full share of its satisfactions and pleasures, and that you are in robust health to enjoy them all, I remain,

Respectfully and most sincerely yours,

GEORGE B. SLOAN.

To Dr. CARLOS MACDONALD,
New York.

ROSSITER & WRIGHT.

NEW YORK, January 10, 1899.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor of State of New York, Albany, N. Y.:

DEAR SIR.— Amid the countless communications that are daily addressed you from friends, committees and organizations relative to the admission of new and the retention of old men in the service of the State, my letter may possibly never reach its destination, yet I would be glad to feel that I had tried to add my recommendation to those of many others for the continuance in office of Mr. Goodwin Brown, who has served so faithfully for many years upon the State Lunacy Commission.

I have known Mr. Brown since early college days, now more than twenty (20) years, and can speak with some knowledge of his honest, straightforward way of dealing with men and of the practical workings of his mind, which call for the effective discharge of his executive duties. These in the past have been rendered with such zest and intelligence that they have won him a most excellent reputation. It would seem, therefore, that they were worthy of your inquiry and, let me hope, of your very favorable consideration.

Very respectfully yours,

EHRICK V. ROSSITER.

DAVID DOWS & CO.

NEW YORK, February 2, 1899.

Governor ROOSEVELT:

MY DEAR GOVERNOR ROOSEVELT.— Not hearing from you relative to Lunacy Commissioner Brown, and fearing that you might make up your mind without having some letters of recommendation relative to him previously placed in your hands, I take the liberty of sending them to you by registered mail, and would beg your kind acknowledgment of their receipt. I feel that I cannot add much more than I have already said in advocacy of the retention of Commissioner Brown from my standpoint of State hospital manager. I believe the State could better afford to lose the services of either of the other Commissioners than Goodwin Brown.

Yours very sincerely,

A. E. ORR.

THE BUFFALO CLUB.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor, State of New York:

MY DEAR GOVERNOR.— Pardon my once more writing you about reappointment of Hon. Goodwin Brown, but my former letter, sent in the busy days before inauguration, may have escaped your attention. I understand that a Democrat is entitled to be appointed for State Commissioner in Lunacy, so that Mr. Brown's politics do not interfere, and as his service has been of a highly meritorious character in the interests of the State, I believe that your sense of justice will stand for him unless there is some very good reason. I much dislike to ask favors for another, but believe that your attention to his official record will do him some good.

I have met you twice in Buffalo, which is my reason for addressing you personally.

I am, with great respect,

Sincerely,

WM. C. CORNWELL,

Pres. City National Bank.

REMARKS IN THE SENATE RELATING TO COMMISSIONER BROWN, ON THE CONFIRMATION OF HIS SUCCESSOR, APRIL 27, 1899.

The Governor, in response to the Senate resolution calling for all papers relating to Commissioner Brown, sent all papers protesting *against* his appointment, but no papers favoring his appointment.

The Senator from the Forty-seventh calls up the report of the Committee on Finance, reporting favorably upon the nomination of Mr. William Church Osborn as a member of the Lunacy Commission.

SENATOR MACKEY:

I have nothing to say against the nominee whose confirmation is under consideration, but I do want to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that this nomination for confirmation displaces a man from the Lunacy Commission who has been a member of the Commission since it was organized. Goodwin Brown came to Albany first in an official capacity in 1883. He was Pardon and Extradition Clerk under Governor Cleveland and under Governor Hill. He was then appointed a member of the Lunacy Commission in 1889. He has continued in that position every since under Governor Hill, Governor Flower, Governor Morton and Governor Black. He has had all the experience that a man can have in this position. He has had much to do with the preparation of the law now upon the statute books relating to the care of the insane. It was through his efforts, and through the recommendation of the commissioners, that the insane in the poor-houses were transferred to the State's care, and are now being maintained by the State. He has been in every way a competent, efficient, honest public official. There is no reason why he at this time should be displaced. There is no reason that I have seen urged against his retention in office, except the fact that his place is wanted by the Governor for one of his personal friends.

Now, during Mr. Brown's administration, or during the time he has been in the Lunacy Commission, the cost of caring for the insane has been reduced from $222 per capita in 1893, to $185 in 1898, a saving to the State in maintenance alone of more than $750,000 a year, and the average appropriations for the insane for all purposes, including buildings, repairs and improvements, during a period of thirty years, from 1865 to 1894, averaged $344. The average appropriation now for all these purposes has been reduced to $254. Now, Mr. President, I desire to call attention here to the fact that the Governor of this State, who has professed himself to be for many years a thorough civil service reformer, violates by this appointment every theory of civil service reform. True civil service reform should not be applied to mere clerks and laborers, but it should apply to those competent and efficient officers like Goodwin Brown, members of the Lunacy Commission, and if a man be a good officer, he should be retained. Now the Governor made these promises last year. He said in his speech: "If you will allow me, I shall do my best to see that the interests of the people are administered for the people, and that every man under me do his duty without fear or favor. If he does his duty, I will stand by him." And at Saratoga he said, "Every competent and efficient servant will find that I am his staunchest friend. When I come to deal with any public servant, with any man under me responsible in any way for our administration, I shall uphold him if he does his duty." Well, those are the pre-election promises of the Governor, and this is the way in which he fulfills them. Goodwin Brown stands endorsed by more people in this State, I venture to say, than ever gave their endorsement for the appointment of any individual. He is endorsed by those who are members of the State Board of Charities, those connected with the asylums, the men in the highest walks of life, and not only that, but he is endorsed to the Republican Governor by nineteen of the Republican Senators sitting around this circle, and this reform Governor, who said he would be the staunchest friend of every honest, capable official, singles out this man, than whom there could be no more competent person, singles him out and puts in his place a man capable, no doubt, but entirely without experience. The promises he made before election he has broken now. Not only now, but he has repeatedly, almost daily, violated the speeches which he made during the campaign. Every principle of home rule or civil service reform, about which he prates very loudly, is violated daily, when he has been signing bills vetoed by the mayor and common councils of various cities.

I simply, Mr. President, desire to call the attention of the Senate to these facts: that this man who has had all this experience and has helped to build up this great institution with which he is connected, who has had to do with the perfecting of the laws, who knows practically all about the subject, against whom there cannot a word be said, is thrown out simply and solely because the Governor of this State has got a friend that he wants a job for.

SENATOR BROWN, Chairman of Forest, Fish and Game Committee:

In the consideration of this nomination by the Governor, there ought not to be any suggestion which is outside of the province of the Senate. The habit has grown upon all legislative bodies vested with the power of confirmation, of encroaching upon the rights of the Executive.

When the question of filling the vacancy caused by the expiration of the term of Goodwin Brown was first broached, I was in favor of the reappointment of Goodwin Brown, who I had believed had been as unusually efficient officer, but, under the constitution and laws of the State, the duty of making nominations to fill this vacancy and like vacancies, rests upon the Governor of the State; and it is wrong for the Senate, and especially wrong and injurious for the friends of Goodwin Brown to assume that it was necessary for the Governor to make some charges against Goodwin Brown before he could name another as his successor in this office. Such a rule is subversive of the constitution, it is destructive of the interests of the State, it is wrong to those who are superceded in their offices. It springs from a feeling that we should get and keep what we can in the line of offices upon one pretense or another. This suggestion that the Governor had no right to name any one except Goodwin Brown, because Goodwin Brown was an efficient public official is wholly unjustifiable. It is an attempt to make a criticism of the Governor when there is not the slightest excuse for it. The Governor, in his message to the Senate, has not said that Goodwin Brown is not an efficient, intelligent public official. The question before the Senate is, whether William Church Osborn will make an efficient public officer; and as I said, without saying a word, without raising

a suggestion against the man whose term has expired, and of whom I surely have said enough to show that my attitude toward him was not unfriendly.

I do say that there has never been a nomination sent to this Senate since I have been a member of it, which was more worthy of confirmation than this one. Mr. Osborn is a man who, by education, by taste, by social position, by sympathy and by work, is the best qualified, or among those who are the best qualified for the performance of the duties of this position. He will bring to the discharge of his duty as high a sense of honor and as deep an interest in the welfare of the people of the State, and as sure a sympathy for the unfortunates who will be entrusted to his charge, as any man that could possibly be named. Under these circumstances, is it not better to say that the wise discretion which has been vested in the Governor in this as well as in all nominations, has been exercised by him, not according, perhaps, to the personal views of the particular friends of Goodwin Brown, but wisely, from the best of motives, and there can be no doubt, with the best results.

SENATOR RAINES, Chairman of Committee on Railroads:

MR. PRESIDENT.— We very early understood that by the limitation of the term of his office a Lunacy Commissioner was to be appointed to succeed Mr. Brown, or else that Mr. Brown would be reappointed. It was early understood that, in any event, a Democrat would be nominated to this office. In view of that fact, and having a choice between Democrats, I had hoped, not only hoped, but earnestly urged, that the present incumbent of that office should be renominated. For reasons best known to the Governor of this State, and for which I shall not criticise him, he has seen fit to send in the name of a gentleman (Mr. Osborn) in place of Mr. Brown. So far as Mr. Osborn is concerned, I know of nothing whatever against him in any respect. So far as his conduct in this case is concerned, I may say that he is a man who has not sought this office. He may have been unfortunate in some of his friends and in some of their actions, but I should not be disposed to let that reflect upon Mr. Osborn. I had expected up to a short time ago to vote for Mr. Brown in any event, but, by the action of Mr. Brown himself in this controversy, I am prepared and shall vote for the confirmation of this nomination, as I voted for the report of it to the Senate, so that, except in honorable effort to convince the Governor that he should be reappointed, Mr. Brown has not been an element in this controversy. What has brought about this conclusion in the mind of the Governor, I do not know. Minds contemplating a subject from a common standpoint may work off in different directions. It is said that there is one point, I think, in the State of Minnesota, where the marking of a stick will turn the waters which flow to the Mississippi into a channel which would take them to the Gulf of the St. Lawrence; so what differences or what influences have turned our minds in different directions, I cannot say. Therefore, Mr. President, what I wish to say to-day is drawn out, not so much by the fact of this nomination, as by something that was put into this controversy as a reflection upon the present Lunacy Commissioner, Mr. Brown, by an irresponsible body of busybodies, the secretary of which is a gentleman by the name of Folks, in the city of New York. It is the only thing that has been brought into the public prints in the city of New York which has seemed to cast the slightest reflection upon a man who for years has served the State with zeal, with fidelity and with ability. This gentleman has written a letter on April thirteenth. It was written two days after the date of the letter which appeared in the public prints from the State Charities Aid Association, and for the purpose of connecting the same, I will quote from it:

"STATE CHARITIES AID ASSOCIATION,
UNITED CHARITIES BUILDING,
NEW YORK, April 13, 1899.

Hon. THEODORE ROOSEVELT, Governor of the State of New York, Executive Chamber, Albany, N. Y.:

MY DEAR SIR.— I have your kind favor of the twelfth inst., and am glad to know that the letter sent by our Board of Managers has been of service to you.

In reply to your inquiry concerning Mr. William Church Osborn, I would say that I have just consulted our acting president, Mrs. Wm. B. Rice, who knows Mr. Osborn, and she agrees with me in the opinion that those of our members who are acquainted with Mr. Osborn, would regard him as admirably adapted in every way for the position of Commissioner in Lunacy."

Now, this letter of the twelfth, to which this letter refers, is the letter sent by the State Charities Aid Association and which was in some way given to the public press of the city of New York, and so far from that letter having been of any service to the Governor, it was the very letter upon which I would have stood, had not Mr. Brown taken himself out of the way, in opposition to the nomination, so long as my vote would have effected it; so there was some mistake somewhere in regard to the efficiency of that letter. Now, what was the letter? I will quote from the same: "In view of the adverse criticism which the non-reappointment of Mr. Goodwin Brown, as Commissioner in Lunacy has incurred, we, the undersigned, Managers of the State Charities Aid Association present at a special meeting of the Board, held Tuesday, April 11, 1899, desire to express to you our entire approval of your action in this regard. In fact, as you will remember, our Committee on the Insane, through its chairman, expressed to you some time ago its views as to the unfitness of Mr. Brown." This was the first thing that appeared in any of the papers in this case of any intimation of unfitness on the part of Mr. Brown for reappointment. "Our Committee on the Insane, whose distinguished chairman, Miss Louisa Lee Schuyler, now absent from the city, inaugurated and carried to final success the movement for State care and maintenance for the insane." I do not care to comment upon that statement, except to say that what some people do not know about the care of the insane would fill a book, and further, that so far as any notice has come to the people of the State that the care of the insane was inaugurated and carried on by any particular person, lady or otherwise, we have never received notice of it before; — "And is recognized as an authority on lunacy administration, has followed very closely the development of the State care system and has kept in close touch with the Lunacy Commission since its establishment in 1889."— I hope if that close touch has continued, no one has been contaminated by its contact with the Lunacy Commission.—"The experience of this committee

has convinced us that a change in the legal member of the Commission would be for the best interest of the insane of the State. Our reasons for this opinion have grown out of long, careful and unprejudiced observation of Mr. Goodwin Brown, and of his methods of work on the Lunacy Commission during the past ten years."— Now here comes in the insinuation which cannot be maintained, and which no one whose name is affixed, either by themselves or somebody else, to the paper would dare to face anywhere, either before a committee or to stand up for it in a court of justice: "The facts observed were not such as could be specified in formal charges, but they have created and strengthened year by year the conviction that at the expiration of his term he ought not to be reappointed." Then follows an essay from these people on the question of civil service reform, and I may here remark that that does not apply to the case of Mr. Goodwin Brown.

"The facts observed cannot be specified in formal charges." Can these gentlemen stand for any such statement as that, when it can be demonstrated that not four of the whole list would recognize Mr. Brown, should they meet him in public or anywhere else? They don't know him, and he doesn't know them. Now, that is the charge that was brought that was so unjust that every feeling for vindication that could be aroused was aroused on my part against such injustice being perpetrated against a faithful public servant. There are barely, aside from that letter — which is not an endorsement of Mr. Osborn, but an attack upon Mr. Brown — three endorsements of the nomination of Mr. Osborn in the Governor's papers. Now Mr. Brown will soon go out of public office, I think, but before he goes, in the face of these charges, I want the public to understand something of what a long career of active service has drawn out from the leading citizens of the State of New York, from judges, from lawyers, from capitalists, from those who have the conduct of the asylum affairs of the State, almost without exception. and from members of the Legislature, in regard to Mr. Brown, as an offset against the mean, miserable insinuations of this irresponsible body of the State Charities Aid Association, against the character of this gentleman. I have here a letter of the late Governor of this State, Roswell P. Flower. Mr. Flower was Governor, and had opportunity to observe the conduct of this office, and he says in a letter to the Governor: "Goodwin Brown, of the Lunacy Commission, is a very competent and worthy man, and I believe, if a Democrat is to be left on the Commission, he is the proper man to fill the place. He has been conversant with all the details of the establishment of the system of State care of the insane, and I found his recommendations wise and prudent to follow. I think a further acquaintance with Mr. Brown during the coming winter will confirm in you my good opinion of him. Sincerely yours, Roswell P. Flower." Here is a letter from a gentleman, at least of standing in the State, the president of one of the Boards of Managers of one of the the hospitals of the State, whose word usually carries some weight, and which says of him: "His experience and the character of his service qualify him for his present position. He has been a member of the Commission for ten years; he drew the present Lunacy law; he led the fight against the corrupt rings that were determined to perpetuate abominations of the former county care of the insane. Commissioner Brown has strong convictions, is devoted to the welfare of the State's unfortunates, and is a strong and square fighter when he knows that he is right." That is signed by Truman J. Backus, President of the Board of Managers of the Long Island State Hospital. I will not take up time to read these letters of endorsement, but simply to say that it includes those of the ex-Speaker of the Assembly, a Republican; the late Attorney-General, Judge Northrup; Sherman S. Rogers, Dr. MacDonald, Senator Sloan, Dr. Brundage, Judge Chester, Judge Wright, Judge Smith, Judge Coxe, Judge Earle; President Schurman, of Cornell University, and by the way, I will call attention to President Schurman's letter, in view of the arguments made in this letter of the Charities Aid Association in regard to the Civil Service part of it: "Cornell University, November 26, 1898. Dear Sir — I understand that the term of Mr. Goodwin Brown, as State Commissioner in Lunacy, expires next year, and I presume you will send nominations to the Senate at an early day in the session. I take the liberty of saying that I have long known Mr. Brown, who is an old student of Cornell University, and that I have always heard his work as State Commissioner in Lunacy spoken of with the highest approval. Reappointments on merit are demanded by the principles of a sound Civil Service, and I believe Mr. Brown's record will be found to bring his case under this general rule. I take great pleasure in recommending him to your favorable consideration." In addition to this are the officials of all the State Hospitals of the State of New York, and, together with this is the endorsement from nineteen Republican Senators about this circle, to which I do not hesitate to say I could have added, had it not been that they had some interest of their own to subserve, the commendation of every other Republican Senator about this circle. Now, I have brought this up, because, aside from this one attack which somebody has seen fit to put into the public prints from this State Charities Aid Association, there is nothing on the record, nothing known of men, nothing that has ever developed, which casts the slightest reflection upon the administration of Mr. Brown as a public officer of the State of New York, or about his personal or private character.

Now, while I regret that the Governor has not seen fit to renominate Mr. Brown, yet Mr. Brown, by his own act, has relieved me from any obligation other than to do what I think proper in regard to considering the nomination of Mr. Osborn; that is to say, as I said before, Mr. Osborn stands in the place of a man who has not sought this office. His conduct all the way through has been fair and above board. and it was so stated to me by Mr. Brown; and, therefore, Mr. President, when the roll is called, I shall in my place vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

SENATOR GRADY, Leader of the Minority:

MR. PRESIDENT.— At this stage of the session, and in view of the immense amount of public business awaiting our action, I cannot ask the Senate to have patience with me longer than it is required to briefly say that the nomination by the Governor in place of Commissioner Brown breaks the last hope that any honest, painstaking official might have had, that in his fidelity to the public interests there was any security for his retention in the commission. It means, that you have not only to be honest and faithful and capable in the discharge of your duty, but means that when the State Charities Aid Association comes to look you over, they should find you, in addition to all this, "nice." What the Governor desires in office is "nice" men; men who have the culture of the most exclusive set; men whose numbers do not run beyond 400: men who, if not found in their office by day, will be found at the german at night; men who are agreeable for

every social function that may be had at the Executive Chamber, and so it is we have come to that condition in our politics that, unless the State Charities Aid Society will permit us to pass muster according to the standard they set, public service we have rendered shall count us naught. The Senator from the thirty-second, with that entire want of appreciation for the solemnity of the occasion, suggests that, in addition to all that, he must be agreeable to the City Club; well, perhaps it is so; perhaps governmental functions have resolved themselves into a State Charities Aid Association on the one hand and the City Club upon the other. If such be the case, it won't last long.

UPON ROLL CALL.

SENATOR BROWN:

I desire to be excused from voting long enough to say that, while this nomination may destroy all hope that those who are in office can always remain in office, it will raise hope in the breasts of many fit candidates for office that they may some time be appointed to office, and it will raise to the highest point the hopes of the people of the State that, in filling offices, the Executive who now holds the chair will not fall below the high standard which the people of the State require. I withdraw my request to be excused, and vote aye.

SENATOR ELLSWORTH, Chairman of Rules Committee:

I ask to be excused from voting. I commended in writing to the Governor the reappointment of Commissioner Brown, in case he had in view the continuance upon that Commission of one of the party to which Mr. Brown politically belongs. I did so, not alone out of regard to Mr. Brown as an individual, but particularly from the belief, entertained upon the observation I had had, that he had been a fit and competent public servant, and filled that place which he had occupied for the number of years, which have been mentioned here, with such ability as could ever be expected by any one effected by that like class of politics. I regret that the Governor did not deem it wise to reappoint him. I have no hesitancy, however, in recognizing the fact that, in sending in this name of Mr. Osborn to fill that position, the Governor has been actuated by the highest motives, by the disposition to exercise the powers which devolve upon him, as shall, within his lights, be best for the people of the State and best for the position to be filled. Yielding to that, I know of no reason why, with the greater opportunities which he has had, I should not gracefully yield my convictions to his and accept the views which are expressed by this nomination, that he believes in one who will perform the better these duties; and, based upon that, I cordially withdraw my request to be excused, and vote aye.

SENATOR GRADY, Minority Leader:

MR. PRESIDENT.— The Senator from the Thirty-fifth suggests that the moral lesson taught by this nomination is that a man cannot stay in office all the time. I need not say to him, that the Executive is giving us a personal illustration of his willingness to serve the public until the end of his days. As to the high standard sought, we have given up all talk about that. After making a convicted padrone a port warden, we may consider that a standard to which our appointments and confirmations are hereafter expected to attain. The lesson taught by the nomination is just what I said. Brown is all right. He knows all about his office and discharges his duties, but he is not "nice." He has business down stairs, making out reports and furnishing statistics when we have functions at the Historical Society, at the Mansion, or the residences of some our best families. We don't meet him; we don't know whether he can dance the german or not; altogether, in that respect, a most unsocial character. What right has he to have an office? Now, I do not know whether Osborn will do any better, but I want to warn him in advance that he if he don't, he will not hold his place long.

I withdraw my request to be excused, and vote "No."

SENATOR MCCARREN:

MR. PRESIDENT.— I know nothing at all about the competency of Mr. Osborn to discharge the duties of the position to which he has been nominated by the Governor; I do know something about the ability of Mr. Brown, but I want to call the attention of the Republican Senators to the trouble involved in the question of the selection of a member of the Democratic party to fill any particular office. We know that there has been some discussion here during the winter with reference to some of the bills that have been before us in which there has been made a provision for bi-partisan selection, and to provide for representatives of the two principal parties. I know that for the past two or three weeks we have been making an effort to provide for the selection of a bi-partisan election commission in the City of New York, and the difficulty has been in making it absolutely secure for the regular Republican organization to have a proper representation. Now, Governor Roosevelt seems to have recognized the principle of minority representation in the selecting of his Lunacy Commission. Inasmuch as he has done that, it seems to me that he ought to do it with a good grace. Now, I have not been apprised of his having advised with anybody authorized or deputized to speak for the Democratic party, in the selection of the minority member of the Lunacy Commission. The Governor has undertaken to select from the Democratic party throughout the State one of its members to fill this place. Now, it seems to me that the Governor ought to act fairly in this matter, and, if he is going to give the Democrats any representation at all in this commission, that he ought to consult somebody that is recognized as an authority in the Democratic organization. That, I believe, he has not done: we know what a contention was aroused over the action of Mayor Van Wyck, in the city of New York, by reason of the removal of the Republican Police Commissioners; we know that it has been insisted, and with no greater force than by the men who are to-day upholding the action of the Governor, that the Republican party should have had something to say about the selection of the men who were appointed by Mayor Van Wyck as the Republican representatives in the Police Commission. Now, I believe myself that that principle ought to be lived up to, and I believe it should be upheld, but unless the men responsible for party politics insist on having some expression as to the representatives of their party, then the principle of minority representation counts for

nothing; if a Democratic Governor is going to be permitted to select Republicans to suit himself, and if a Republican Governor is going to be permitted to select Democrats to suit himself, then there is nothing at all in the principle of bi-partisan representation.

I have no criticism to make about the appointment of Mr. Osborn. He is a very good man and may make a very good Commissioner, but Mr. Brown has made a mark in the establishment of this Commission and in building it up to its present condition. I regret that the Governor has not seen fit to reappoint him, and I am still more sorry that he has not seen fit to recognize the principle that runs to selection of minority representatives in any commission. I withdraw my request to be excused, and vote "No."

SENATOR STRANAHAN, Chairman of Cities Committee:

I asked to be excused from voting and briefly state my reasons.

MR. PRESIDENT.— Goodwin Brown is a native of the county in which I live, and the executive capacity and fidelity to public duty which he has shown in the discharge of his office has been a source of pride to that community. Many of them hope to see him renominated and confirmed; among them conspicuous is the gentleman to whom the Senator from the Forty-second has referred, who has acted as chairman of Finance in this body during the incumbency of Mr. Brown, and who testifies of his confidence and commendation in the discharge of his office. I only say, Mr. President, and in no spirit of criticism of the present nominee, that I hope the nominee of the Governor, Mr. Osborn, will be proved as efficient and as faithful in the discharge of his office as has been Mr. Brown. I withdraw my request to be excused, and vote in the affirmative.

SENATOR WHITE, Chairman of the Committee on Public Education:

MR. PRESIDENT.— I ask to be excused from voting, and briefly state my reasons:

The second or third time that the Senator from the Forty-Seventh has seen fit to criticise the Governor for his appointments seems to me to call for brief consideration. It is the second time that the Governor has been charged with appointing personal friends to office. I doubt very much if the distinguished Senator for one moment believes that accusation; I doubt if any man within the sound of my voice believes that personal consideration for one instant influenced this or any other choice that the Governor has made. Whether the person nominated be a friend of the Governor, I do not know, but I do know this, that the overwhelming majority of the people of this State believe that this action is based, not upon any personal consideration, but upon a proposition solely to benefit the public service.

The gentleman, also, for the second or third time, talks about a violation of Civil Service reform. The gentleman knows better. He knows that this is no violation of Civil Service reform. There is no theory of Civil Service reform that would allow a Governor to appoint any man, or reappoint any man, unless he believed that appointment, or that reappointment, was for the highest ends of the public service.

In regard to the humorous pleasantries indulged in by the Senator from the Fourteenth, I have only to say this; and I say it with all deference to many of the members of this body whose splendid public service, whose splendid efforts in defence of the Union, have entitled them to our undying gratitude, and yet I want to say that no man within the sound of my voice has rendered service braver, more patriotic, than has Theodore Roosevelt; no man has endured greater personal peril, no man has undergone greater fatigue, or greater danger for the defence of the Union and for the recognition of those principles of humanity which we all love and honor. I withdraw, Mr. President, my request to be excused and vote "Aye."

RESOLUTIONS OF THE STATE COMMISSION IN LUNACY.

Whereas, After a service of more than ten years as a Commissioner in Lunacy of the State of New York, the Hon. Goodwin Brown has retired from the Commission, and it is appropriate that the existing Commission record its esteem of his work and administration; and

Whereas, The present admirable design and system of the official work of this department and of the State Hospital system is in large part due to the untiring efforts of Mr. Brown while a Commissioner, and is considered, by those best fitted to judge of its worth, worthy of the highest praise; and

Whereas, He was a chief factor in creating that memorable chapter in the history of lunacy in New York, known as the "State Care Act"; and

Whereas, Mr. Brown's services to the State in this regard present an illustration of the best political economics, and offer a brilliant example of humanitarianism; having been always directed to the interests of the State, and never having overlooked the safety and welfare of the insane, for which the State Care Act was created; now, therefore,

Resolved, That, in the opinion of the Commission in Lunacy, on the retirement of Mr. Brown from the Commission, the State loses a valuable and conscientious servant; the insane, a persistent, benevolent and able advocate, and his former colleagues, a friend valued for his manhood, loyalty and the absolute courage of his convictions.

RESOLUTIONS OF STATE HOSPITAL SUPERINTENDENTS.

At the conference of medical superintendents of New York State Hospitals, held at Lake Placid on August 1, 1899, the following resolution was unanimously adopted on the retirement of Goodwin Brown from the office of State Commissioner in Lunacy:

Resolved, That in the retirement of the Hon. Goodwin Brown from the State Commission in Lunacy, with which he had been identified as legal Commissioner since its organization, in 1889, the State Hospital service has lost a faithful, zealous and efficient officer.

That the medical superintendents in this conference assembled recognize the important part played by Commissioner Brown in the establishment of State care of the insane, as well as his skill and ability as an administrative officer.

That Commissioner Brown's persistent and intelligent efforts on behalf of the dependent insane resulted in an elevation of the general standard of care throughout the State.

That the medical superintendents are sensible of their loss, in official and personal fellowship, by reason of Commissioner Brown's retirement, and bespeak for him in private life a degree of prosperity and happiness commensurate with his conspicuous deserts.

Following the adoption of the above, a handsome gold watch, suitably inscribed, was presented to Mr. Brown.

The following editorials voice the unanimous opinion of the Press of New York State:

(Brooklyn Daily Eagle, April 5, 1899.)

COMPLICATION IN STATE LUNACY MATTER.

Goodwin Brown, the present Democratic member of the State Lunacy Commission, has been an excellent officer. William Van Amee, of Orange County, the Democrat nominated by Governor Roosevelt to succeed Mr. Brown, would make an excellent official. Really, between two such excellent Democrats no choice can be made.

The Governor, however, has been sore beset. There are good men, who know little about the administration of public trusts, who were against Mr. Brown. There are better men, who know more about the action of the Lunacy Commission, who are for him. There are bad men, who are for Mr. Brown, for good reasons. There are good men, as already said, against him, for bad reasons. And the best men who are for him are for him for the best reasons.

And we haven't heard of anybody who is against Mr. Van Amee, for adequate reasons, or who is for him, except in the event of the Governor's inveterate purpose not to continue Mr. Brown. It is alleged of Mr. Van Amee that he supported Judge Maynard for nomination and voted for him at the polls. That act is explained by the friendship — almost amounting to comradeship — between Mr. Van Amee and Judge Maynard. The explanation may or may not suffice for the Senate. As a fact, however, though Judge Maynard did wrong, and was properly defeated, many men who voted against him were worse than he was, and many men who voted for him, for party reasons, regretted the error which he made. Mr. Van Amee's act has a relation to the consistency of politics, but none at all to the certainty that he would make an excellent officer, if he were appointed.

We have no doubt that Mr. Brown, in the period of his long service, has secured the friendship and respect of men in both parties, and made politicians as well as reformers reluctant to part with him. Nor have we any doubt that Mr. Van Amee, as the friend and townsman of Chairman Odell, would be accceptable to him, as a representative of the minority in a Republican State board.

Mr. T. E. McGarr is the secretary of the Board of State Lunacy Commission, and has large powers and $4,000 a year. He is a Democrat and a scholar and a Civil Service reformer. He spends his days in careful attention to his duties and his nights in study of languages, political economy or other uplifting knowledges. He knows everything about the contracts which the board has to give out, and too much about some of the contractors, who cannot impose upon the board, so long as he is its secretary, for the comfort of such contractors. His salary, as said, is $4,000 a year, and so long as Mr. Brown and Dr. Wise are two of the three commissioners, that long will he continue to be the secretary of the board. William L. Parkhurst — the straight Republican member of the board, a relative of Senator Raines — is neither unfair nor unfriendly to Mr. McGarr, but he is such a partisan that he would probably vote to supersede him with a Republican, if his vote could acccomplish that and if the Republican was one whom the State organization wanted to have the place.

We do not know whether Mr. Van Amee, should he go in, would re-inforce the non-adamantine backbone of Dr. Wise, the professional member of the board, and thus keep Mr. McGarr in his place, or whether he would, to please Mr. Odell, join with Mr. Parkhurst in voting Mr. McGarr out and in putting an Odell Republican in as secretary. We know Mr. Van Amee ought to stand by Mr. McGarr, and we think he would, but we also know that Mr. Brown has stood by him so effectively, that Dr. Wise has adhered to him, too, and Mr. Parkhurst has maintained toward him a smiling front of non-malevolent neutrality. We doubt that Governor Roosevelt is aware of the circumstances which make Mr. McGarr the key of the situation, and which cause a lot of extremely active Republican politicians to find in Mr Brown more faults than his occasional rough manner, which could be improved, and which he is trying very hard to improve.

The Governor has not had a happy experience in meeting this situation. Mr. Van Amee's Maynard complication has jumped up as a surprise in the path, and mawworm use is being made of it with some canting effect. The chorus of praise for Mr. Brown from many sources comes from voices which the Governor — not without reason — thought would be satisfied with the excellent personal character of Mr. Van Amee. But they were not, and are not, and the Governor is having a bad quarter of an hour. Nor is he wholly blameless in the matter. While he never promised Mr. Brown's friends that he would continue him in office, he did intimate to them that he probably would do so, and there is reason to believe, that he told some of them that they should have a hearing, before he took action adverse to Mr. Brown. They have not had such a hearing, though the Governor probably believes either that he did not make the promise or that he has given to them the equivalent of a hearing, which they do not think has been the case.

Should Mr. Van Amee's nomination be "hung up," Mr. Brown would remain as a holdover under an executive adverse to his retention and able to impair his influence Mr. Van Amee — in such an event — would also be unjustly reflected upon and the Governor would be mortified and, perhaps, angered by a setback. The Eagle has no special advice to give, in a situation which could better have been altogether

avoided. Mr. Brown is an excellent Democrat, and is in office, and knows all about it and has a good record in it. Mr. Van Amee is an excellent Democrat, and he would make an excellent officer. but he could not make a better one than Mr. Brown is, and he might feel required to turn out Mr. McGarr — a man who should certainly be retained. The Governor has acted, but the Senate is still to act; and the Senate, taking carefully into acccount all the circumstances of the case, without regard to personal interest or personal feeling, should deem the public welfare to be paramount to any other consideration in this complicated matter.

(New York Tribune, April 6, 1899.)

THE LUNACY COMMISSIONERSHIP.

Governor Roosevelt's nomination of a State Commissioner in Lunacy involves two distinct questions. One is the propriety of superseding Commissioner Brown. The other is the fitness for the place of the man chosen to be his successor. To justify a search for a successor at all it is necessary to discover some good reason for the retirement of Mr. Brown. Without such reason all the rules of the Civil Service reformer, all the dictates of fair play, required his continuation in an office where he had done conspicuously good service and made of the gigantic experiment of State care a great administrative success and an unspeakable blessing to the insane unfortunates. The strongest considerations not of private liking, but of public interest, were urged upon the Governor by experts in the care of the insane. Some of Mr. Brown's most earnest supporters paid him the remarkable tribute of recommending him as the fittest man in the State for the office, in spite of what might almost be called their personal dislike, for it is no secret that Mr. Brown is not a man of popularity, and holds men's respect rather than their enthusiasm. Under such circumstances, weighty reasons must have led a reform Governor to change his known intention and suddenly refuse to reappoint this excellent public servant.

The mystery of this refusal is not removed by the ostensible reasons for it. It is said that Mr. Brown spent money too lavishly He only spent what a Republican Legislature, Governor and Comptroller allowed. The Lunacy Commission took charge of a number of county hospitals which had long been mismanaged and neglected, and it has been necessary to spend large sums to put them in decent order The Commissioners who had the courage to face this emergency deserve praise rather than blame. Yet in five years the per capita cost of the hospitals has been reduced from $222 to $185, and Commissioner Brown has been most insistent in enforcing business methods and economical management upon superintendents of hospitals. If economy is desired, why are not appropriations cut down? Yet this year's bill contains the usual $5,000,000 for the insane.

Another reason for Mr. Brown's retirement is ex-Comptroller Roberts's complaint of the Commissioner's expenditures. But Mr. Roberts in December last wrote a long and enthusiastic letter to Governor Roosevelt asking him to retain Mr. Brown. Another allegation is that Mr. Brown favored the appointment of attorneys for the State Hospitals. He denies that he invented the scheme or did more than say that if the Republican Legislature was bent on creating those offices he would do his best to get from them needed legal services that the Attorney-General's office seemed unable to give. Perhaps Mr. Brown did find it necessary to consent to this bit of patronage grabbing by the Republicans as the price of necessary appropriations for a department whose leading spirit was a Democrat. If so, is it for Republicans now to blame the helpless Democrat for being "held up"? Did the Republican members, Mr. Parkhurst and Dr. Wise, make any opposition? Or has the Republican Legislature abolished those attorneyships this year? On the contrary, it has firmly fixed the appropriation for them so that it cannot be vetoed. It ill becomes Republicans to make this scandal, of Republican origin and Republican execution, the excuse for displacing a Democrat whose office is desired for a friend and neighbor of Mr. Odell.

The fact that Mr. Odell's friend has the nomination adds peculiar significance to Mr. Brown's own explanation of his displacement.

"The real reason for my retirement is my refusal to obey Odell's orders to discharge the secretary of the Commission, Mr. McGarr, and appoint a machine man in his place. I received an intimation some time ago that if I would vote for Mr. McGarr's discharge Odell would let up on his fight against me, but I refused. This is the first time that politics has been introduced in this Commission and politics is entirely responsible for my retirement."

That, at least, can be understood. It is not so lame as the other excuses. It fits in with our surmise of yesterday that the Governor felt obliged to keep on reasonable terms with the organization for great public ends, and the necessity of conciliating the organization may explain Governor Roosevelt's change of mind on this subject within the last week it was before him.

As to Mr. Van Amee, his confirmation would forever close the mouth of the Republican party on the greatest moral issue it has had in this State for many years. Mr. Van Amee has published a card saying he nominated Judge Maynard "to testify to his personal worth. While I deeply regretted the incident which aroused such fierce discussion, I felt that the duty of a friend was to stand by a friend when he was in trouble — not when everything was smooth sailing." We honor Mr. Van Amee for standing by his friend. But it is one thing to stand by a friend who has done wrong and is in trouble, to comfort him, admonish him, even shield him; and it is another thing to try to make the public reward him for a crime. A father may pity a defaulting son and pay his debts and perhaps save him from prison, but he must not try afterward to put him in somebody's bank as a trustworthy cashier. Mr. Van Amee was not merely testifying personal loyalty, but trying to reward political crime, and if he cannot now see that, his blindness is an evidence of his unfitness for official trust.

Another thing to be said about Mr. Van Amee is that he is not a Democrat. In the last campaign he published a written repudiation of that party, declaring in view of the present principles of the Democracy in this State, "I am no longer a Democrat." He supported Republicans for Congress and the Legislature, and presumably also voted for Mr. Roosevelt. In that, of course, he did right. If Governor Roosevelt wishes to make the Commission in Lunacy a strictly Republican body, he has the power to do so. But if that is the intention let it be known, and let us not have the Commission called non-partisan on the pre-

tence that a man is a Democrat who for three years has opposed that party and says he does not belong to it. A wiser course would be to correct the mistake and save the Republican party from condoning Maynardism and preserve the non-political character of the Commission in Lunacy.

(Utica Daily Press, April 7, 1899.)

ABOUT THE LUNACY COMMISSION.

An interesting feature just now in State affairs has to do with the Lunacy Commission, an institution which, by the way, ought, for the best interests of all concerned, to be kept as far as possible from the turmoil of politics. The question arises over the choice of a successor to Hon. Goodwin Brown, who for several years, and indeed since its organization, has been a member of that Commission. Involved in it more or less as a side issue is the continuance of T. E. McGarr, formerly of this city, as secretary. In the latter, Uticans have a special interest because of their acquaintance and friendship with Mr. McGarr, and because the State Hospital here brings us into intimate relations with the Lunacy Commission. It is but common fairness to say that Mr. McGarr has been a most efficient secretary. For years previous to his connection with the Commission his employment was such as to give him an excellent insight into hospital management, and no Commission can have or hope to have a better secretary, and that without any regard to his political preferences.

It is doubtful if any other candidate for appointment under the hospital administration had better or more representative endorsement than Goodwin Brown. They came from those familiar with lunacy matters, and were by no means confined to men who had always been in accord with his ideas. Those who differed from him earnestly and aggressively were always ready to concede his honesty and sincerity and likewise his entire freedom from political bias. They realize that he has executive ability of a high order, has organized and unified the great lunacy system of New York and brought it to a state where economy is combined with efficiency in modern methods. Mr. Van Namee, whom the Governor has appointed, is doubtless an excellent man against whom or whose ability nothing can be said. It must remain, however, an indisputable fact that the brightest of men must devote themselves assiduously for two or three years to the task before they can begin to have the grasp of the situation and the understanding of the whole business possessed by Mr. Brown. He understands the business in all its details, and is devoted to the undertaking which has engrossed all his time and attention for several years.

So far as the political question enters into it at all — and that by rights should be mighty little — it is well enough to bear in mind that the other two members of the Commission are now Republicans, and that Mr. Brown, like Mr. Van Namee, is a gold Democrat. The former's introduction to State politics was as pardon clerk for Grover Cleveland when he was Governor. He held the same office under Governor Hill until the organization of the Lunacy Commission, when he was made a member of that body, and under successive administrations has retained his position. He has sought only the betterment of the service without regard to the politics of any incumbent. To put the State's greatest charity into the hands of politics would be the severest blow that could be dealt to it. That would be a sin not only against the taxpayers, but against the more than 20,000 unfortunates who are the wards of the State. About the only objection urged against Mr. Brown is that he is brusque. It is true that he is outspoken even to the point of bluntness sometimes, but that is infinitely better than deception, misrepresentation and saying one thing while meaning another. In this respect he is not unlike Governor Roosevelt himself. People have no hesitancy in knowing where Mr. Brown stands on any question connected with hospital affairs. In all honesty these facts deserve to be stated and made emphatic, not as any aspersion upon the Governor's first choice, but in justice to a gentleman whose official career has much about it which deserves commendation.

(Troy Daily Times, April 7, 1899.)

THE NOMINATION WITHDRAWN.

Governor Roosevelt has righted a wrong. He has withdrawn his nomination of William Van Amee, of Newburgh, to be a member of the State Commission in Lunacy.

The friends and admirers of Governor Roosevelt know that only lack of acquaintance with Van Amee's record could have permitted such a nomination. When Governor Roosevelt discovered that he had named for one of the most important positions in the State the man who, after Isaac H. Maynard's election juggling, had become "a byword and a hissing," was ostensibly the instrument by which Maynard was presented to the people for their highest court, the Governor withdrew the appointment. A eulogist of Maynard should not be named even to care for the insane.

This withdrawal places the Republican party right again on the question of inflexible hostility to the defiance of the people's will, either by theft at the ballot box, or by seizure in the rooms of a canvassing board. It was Mr. Van Amee's misfortune, unexceptional though his character may be, that he had condoned in the most exaggerated form the offense of Maynard, for the Republican party cannot condone it. To quote the New York Tribune: "As to Mr. Van Amee, his confirmation would forever close the mouth of the Republican party on the greatest moral issue it has had in this State for many years."

To displace the oldest and most efficient member of the State Commission in Lunacy with an apologist for Maynard, has proved unacceptable to the people, to the Republican party and to the Governor himself. How about displacing Commissioner Brown at all, for whose retention nineteen Republican Senators, three justices of the Supreme Court, President Schurman, of Cornell University, former State Comptroller Roberts and a host of other prominent Republicans have asked, although Commissioner Brown is a Democrat?

If we understand Civil Service reform, its cardinal principle — and it is a good one — is that tenure of office should be regulated by faithful and efficient service in that office. Particularly is this recognized as applicable to those positions regarded as non-partisan, such as Mr. Brown's place in the Lunacy Commission. It was this view of the case that led so many prominent Republicans to ask that Commissioner Brown, though a Democrat, be retained. Governor Roosevelt himself, a prince among Civil Service reformers, frequently declared this as his attitude in the speeches which he made to the people of the State while soliciting their votes in his support as a candidate for Governor. At Mechanicville he said:

"If you will let me, I shall do my best to see that the interests of the people are ministered for the people, and that every man under me does his duty without fear and without favor. If he does his duty I will stand by him."

At Saratoga:

"Every competent and efficient servant will find that I am his staunchest friend."

And at Glens Falls:

"When I come to deal with any public servant, with any man under me responsible in any way for our administration, I shall uphold him if he does his duty well."

Those are noble words, and they are in line with Governor Roosevelt's record during his career in public office. The New York Tribune argues along the same line when it says:

"To justify a search for a successor at all it is necessary to discover some good reason for the retirement of Mr. Brown. Without such reason all the rules of the Civil Service reformer, all the dictates of fair play, required his continuation in an office where he had done conspicuously good service and made of the gigantic experiment of State care a great administrative success and an unspeakable blessing to the insane unfortunates. The strongest considerations, not of private liking, but of public interest, were urged upon the Governor by experts in the care of the insane. Some of Mr. Brown's most earnest supporters paid him the remarkable tribute of recommending him as the fittest man in the State for the office, in spite of what might almost be called their personal dislike, for it is no secret that Mr. Brown is not a man of popularity, and holds men's respect rather than their enthusiasm. Under such circumstances weighty reasons must have led a reform Governor to change his known intention and suddenly refuse to reappoint this excellent public servant."

It is scarcely to be supposed, however, that Mr. Brown has been rightly informed as to the reason for his retirement when he says, according to The Tribune:

"The fact that Mr. Odell's friend has the nomination adds peculiar significance to Mr. Brown's own explanation of his displacement.

'The real reason for my retirement is my refusal to obey Odell's orders to discharge the secretary of the Commission, Mr. McGarr, and appoint a machine man in his place. I received an intimation some time ago that if I would vote for Mr. McGarr's discharge, Odell would let up on his fight against me, but I refused. This is the first time that politics has been introduced in this Commission, and politics is entirely responsible for my retirement.'

"That, at least, can be understood. It is not so lame as the other excuses. It fits in with our surmise of yesterday that the Governor felt obliged to keep on reasonable terms with the organization for great public ends, and the necessity of conciliating the organization may explain Governor Roosevelt's change of mind on this subject within the last week it was before him."

When Governor Roosevelt learned what relation the nomination of Mr. Van Amee had to Maynardism, he withdrew the appointment. When Governor Roosevelt learns what relation the superseding of Commissioner Brown has to Civil Service reform, even if Mr. Brown's understanding of the case should not prove to be final as to motive, he will undoubtedly refuse to make another appointment for the place.

Form 959 4-25-'01-500

STATE OF NEW YORK—STATE COMMISSION IN LUNACY

ALBANY, N. Y.

WILLIAM CHURCH OSBORN,
WILLIAM L. PARKHURST, } *Commissioners.*

APRIL 10th, 1901.

To Hospitals and Institutions for the Insane:

The State Commission in Lunacy has for many years been impressed with the necessity of securing additional legislation from Congress to more effectually exclude the alien insane from this country. A few years ago the Commission secured the introduction of a bill for this purpose but no especial effort was made to secure its adoption as the time did not seem propitious.

At the last session of Congress—the short session—the Commission through its counsel secured the introduction of a bill on somewhat similar lines to the bill introduced a few years ago. This bill met with the most favorable reception, being favorably and unanimously reported from the House Committee on Immigration. The bill also received the cordial support of the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration and the Secretary of the Treasury, who wrote to the Speaker warmly endorsing the measure.

At the hearing before the house Committee the measure was also warmly and ably supported by Doctor A. B. Richardson, Superintendent of the Government Asylum for the Insane.

Mr. Goodwin Brown, Ex-State Commissioner in Lunacy, the counsel for the Commission, also appeared before the United States Industrial Commission and there is little doubt but that the measure will be strongly supported by this Commission in its final report to be presented at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

Following is the argument of Mr. Brown before the Industrial Commission, the report of the House Committee, the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, and a copy of the bill.

It is hoped that an examination of this document will enlist your support and co-operation in securing the passage of this most desirable measure and it is trusted that you will communicate with the representatives in the United States Senate from your State and the members of Congress from your locality.

The State Commission in Lunacy would be pleased to receive from you at the earliest possible date, your views and recommendations to the end that it may be able to present the same to the Immigration Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives at the next session of Congress.

Kindly address all communications to the State Commission in Lunacy, Albany, New York.

BY THE COMMISSION:

T. E. McGARR,
Secretary.

U. S. INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 5, 1900.

ARGUMENT OF MR. GOODWIN BROWN,

Counsel for the New York State Commission in Lunacy.

The commission met at 10.15 A. M., Vice-Chairman Phillips presiding. At that time Mr. Goodwin Brown, of New York City, counsel for the New York State Commission in Lunacy, spoke as follows:

Q. (By Mr. CLARKE). Will you please give your post-office address?—A. 192 Broadway, New York City.

Q. How long has the New York State Commission in Lunacy been established?—A. Since 1889.

Q. What is its particular duty?—A. If you will permit me, I might make a little statement in regard to it. The system is so extensive that I hardly know where to begin, but I might make a few preliminary observations. New York State is peculiar in this, I think, that it is the only State, so far as I am aware, that has established solely and exclusively what is known as State care of the insane. In other words, the State of New York, since 1893, or practically since 1890, pays absolutely for the support of all the dependent insane within its borders. One great difficulty in regard to the treatment of this subject of caring for the insane—as of all the dependent classes, I conceive, in the past in the various States—is the conflict between the State and the various municipalities. Prior to 1836 in the State of New York, or I might say prior to 1843, for the first act was passed in 1836, the care of the insane was purely a local affair—that is, they were cared for by towns, by cities, by municipalities, counties, etc. In 1843 the first lunatic asylum was established in the State, at Utica, to care for a limited number of insane; and from that time up to 1890 a large number of institutions have been established, the State paying a portion of the expense and the counties a portion, sometimes the cities. But the abuses became so great in the care of the insane by the local authorities, principally by reason of the fact that the local authorities were unwilling to appropriate the necessary money, that an act was passed in 1890 providing for the care of all the insane by the State. Certain counties were exempted, notably New York, Kings, and Monroe, and the act provided that those counties might turn over their insane to the State on certain terms. The last of those counties turned over its insane in 1896, so that from 1896 down, under the provisions of the act of 1890, as I said before, New York pays absolutely all the expenses whatsoever. It has ceased to be a local affair in any sense, with this possible exception, that the local authorities are obliged to provide the clothing on admission—which must be new—and pay the expenses of the commitment; after that has been done the State from that time on assumes all expenses.

Q. You believe that is the only State in the Union which does that?—A. Well, I will not say that absolutely. I think there are one or two States in the West—the newer States—that started out at once with a system of State care. I never have looked into it particularly, but I think that is the case, possibly. There are some States which divide the expenditures—that is, where they have, you might say, State control with a portion of the expense paid by the counties or the municipalities, but in New York the municipalities, towns, cities and counties were relieved of all taxes whatsoever. The burden absolutely was shifted to the State. To-day there is a great confusion in the State of New York in the minds of many people who do not understand it, and who think that the expenses of the State government have enormously increased. They have increased theoretically, you might say, by about $5,000,000, for the cost of caring for the insane in the State of New York to-day is about $5,000,000 a year. On the other hand, of course, the municipalities have been relieved entirely from that tax.

In 1889, about coincident with the passage of this State care act, the State provided for the establishment of a State Commission in Lunacy—that is, the interests had become so vast and so complicated that it was felt that it was necessary to have a separate board having jurisdiction and control over the matter. Therefore the State Legislature created what is now known as the State Commission in Lunacy consisting of three paid members, which has sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the insane, and this was followed in 1894, in the last constitutional convention, by making the Commission a constitutional body and devolving on this Commission the sole and exclusive care of the insane, and excluding from its jurisdiction the care of idiots and epileptics, a jurisdiction, which up to that time—up to the 1st of January, 1895—they had. So that the State of New York is unique in this, that the care of the insane is not complicated, if you please, with any other question whatever. The Commission at that time objected somewhat the removal of its jurisdiction over idiots and epileptics, on the ground that they were so interlocked, if you please that it might lead to some serious question, but on the whole I think it has been a satisfactory thing.

The minute that that happened, the whole organization became centralized, and the legislature, from the time of the creation of the Commission, began constantly to extend its powers, and, beginning with 1893, it gave it control over expenditures for fixed charges, what we call ordinary board or maintenance; that was extended in 1895 to cover expenditures for buildings, and, by subsequent acts, all expenditures whatsoever.

Now, following as a necessary consequence of all that, a very elaborate system in that State has grown up, which has enabled the State to go into all sorts of questions in a careful and scientific way which it was impossible that the State could go into prior to that time on account of the conflicting jurisdictions. I recall very well when I was appointed in 1889 that we had to deal in some instances with towns, in some instances with counties, sometimes with cities, and there was a constant conflict. We had great difficulty in procuring information, getting statistics, etc. It was almost impossible for a time there to know what the cost of caring for the insane was. So that we felt, in order to bring about any systematic effort, that we should have absolute control. And about that time the State conferred the authority of removal of insane from its borders that belonged to other States and countries. Up to that time that duty had devolved on the State board of charities. After this organization had been perfected and after the financial side of it had been settled, then the Commission began to turn its attention to various other questions. Of course, the first thing to do was to establish a uniform system of accounts, a uniform system of commitment, a uniform system of dietary, of wages, of officers' salaries, etc.; all of that has been worked out. Then came other questions. Up to that time the State was in the habit of receiving everyone that came and asking no questions; and, in fact, practically to-day that is what the State is obliged to do, although it is empowered to return lunatics before or after commitment, in its discretion. Now, the most startling thing that we found when we came to look at this question was the disproportion between the number of insane of foreign parentage as compared with the inhabitants of the State; that certainly was the most startling thing. And I might say here something about the increase in the number of the insane. There has been a great deal of public talk, you might say, a great many observations in regard to the increase of the insane. It is very questionable whether the insane actually are increasing. I do not think at this time it can be known that it is true. For instance, apparently they increase much faster than population. We attribute that very largely to the fact that more of the insane are being given public care and treatment than formerly. The management of the institutions of the State of New York to-day is so satisfactory that relatives and friends are no longer unwilling, as they were formerly, to commit insane persons to the public institutions. So that I can conceive that the increase can largely be accounted for in that way; that is, so far as the native population is concerned, laying aside, of course, this question of insane being brought in here from other countries. I can recall very well when I was a young man and lived in the country that it was not an uncommon thing at all to have pointed out to me by my father a certain house in the locality where an insane person was kept. I think that, practically, has passed away. The insane up to 1890 were increasing in the State at the rate, perhaps, of about 1,000 a year—that is, there was a net increase. In the last few years the number has dropped down, and I think the last year it was between 600 and 700, and I think that has been the average for the last four or five years—that is, the absolute net increase. I always believed personally that the time would come when the increase in the insane would just about keep pace with the population, and, in fact, that as medical science advanced the number would tend to diminish, as, in other words, insanity now is regarded as a disease to be cured. Of course, it is a disease which is likely to grow. Then, further, a good many of these people are committed over and over again, discharged as cured, and perhaps in a few months they come back. And I might say here that the State of New York has unlimited means, of course, at its disposal, and that no reasonable expenditure has been spared to discover the causes of insanity, to employ the most skillful physicians, to give these people proper food, clothing, nurses, and attendants; and violence in an institution has almost practically ceased. That is, there is not one violent case now where there used to be 10.

Q. (By Mr. CLARKE). What do you mean by violence—on the part of the attendants or on the part of the insane?—A. On the part of the insane. I remember in 1890 that I walked through one of those wards, and it was so terrible that I came back outside. Now, that has all practically disappeared simply for the reason that the State employs a vast number of people to take care of them; and perhaps a few figures here will not be out of place. The State to-day employs in round numbers one employee to every five insane persons, to care for them, and there is—I am only giving round numbers here—perhaps one physician to every 170. The number of insane during the past year, as I see by the last report of the Lunacy Commission, is something over 23,000; about 1,000 of those are in the private institutions, so that there is a permanent number at the present time of about 22,000 dependent cases, and they are increasing at the rate of about 700 a year.

Q. Does that increase include recommitments?—A. No, that is the net increase; for instance, there are 700 more at the end of any one year than there were the previous year—actual persons. So you see this is becoming an immense thing. In 10 years more at that same rate of increase there will be 6,000 more. To-day, say, we have 22,000 in all—in 10 years more there will be 29,000. It does not require very many figures to show where this is likely to lead.

Of course, personally I do not have the same feeling of apprehension about it perhaps that a person might who had had no experience. These people must be cared for somewhere, either in homes or in public institutions. My own judgment has been, and that has been the judgment of the Commission, that it is better to care for these people in public institutions than to have them cared for at home or wandering about the country, because they are constantly committing acts, if not of violence, of depredation; and often when they are cared for at home, they break up families, they destroy earning capacity, they cause untold suffering and misery; so that it has been the policy of the State to take in every person that is properly committed. And I might say right here that the safeguards in regard to the reception of persons other than insane are very carefully drawn. The superintendent of a State hospital in New York can override a judge's order. That is, a judge may sign an order for the commitment of a lunatic; and if that lunatic is brought to the hospital for reception and the superintendent believes that the person is not insane, he can refuse to receive him. Of course the State is very anxious to return these people, to discharge them and get rid of them. Vast numbers of writs of habeas corpus are taken out. The position of the State is that it simply throws the responsibility on the courts. It makes no objections before a court to the discharge of any person, except to insist that the court shall have before it ample information. Then if the court decides to take the responsibility, the State makes no objection.

Now, another point—in regard to the extent to which private individuals pay for the support of the insane: The ratio is about 1 to 16; in other words, the fixed charges for caring for the insane in the State of New York are about, in round numbers, $4,000,000 a year, and the friends and relatives contribute about $250,000; I think that is about one-sixteenth. In the State of Ohio, if I am correctly informed, no charge is made by the State whatsoever, and any person can be committed as a State charge—that is so far as the hospitals for the insane are concerned. Vast numbers in Ohio are cared for in the county houses, as I understand it.

Now, with that as a preliminary statement, the thing which I conceive this commission is more particularly interested in is the effect of foreign immigration. There are some things about that that are certainly very puzzling. By the census of 1890—and I think the last census shows the same thing practically—the foreign population of the State of New York constitutes 25 per cent of the whole. The foreign population in the hospitals for the insane in New York is 50 per cent and a fraction over. Exactly how that is to be accounted for, you gentlemen perhaps can determine.

Q. (By Mr. KENNEDY). You mean foreign born?—A. I mean foreign born—exactly 50 per cent, while there is only 25 per cent in the State. Now, the conclusion is inevitable in my mind that in the admission of immigrants here the defective classes have not been kept out. I will not undertake to say that it has been a systematic effort on the part of foreign countries, or a deliberate effort, to send out of those countries defective persons for the sake of their care and support in this country; but I do say this, that it has been done, that an undue proportion of those persons have been sent out and have been received here. Of course the State of New York suffers more by this than any other State.

Q. (By Mr. CLARKE). Have you any information as to whether there has been an increase or a decrease in the immigration of these insane people, or mentally defective people, in recent years?—A. I do not think so. I am sorry that I have not here the last report of the Commission in Lunacy, but there they present a table showing the fluctuations. In 10 years it has varied from, say, about 40 per cent up to 50; some years it has risen to 50, and last year it had risen to 50 per cent—the year ending September 30, 1899, what we call the last fiscal year.

Q. Do the statistics show what countries they come from mostly?—A. Yes; that of course is a thing that could be figured out; but I could not give it to you offhand here except to say that, of course, the greatest number come from Ireland.

Q. (By Mr. FARQUHAR). Can you furnish this table with your testimony now?—A. No; I can not.

Q. Well, you can send it to us with your revised testimony?—A. Oh, yes; I can send the figures in regard to that, showing exactly the countries where they come from. It is well known that that is not only true in regard to the insane but it is true in regard to the prisons; it is true in regard to all public institutions. I have noted that repeatedly in the State of New York. And I might say in this connection that prior to being a State Commissioner in Lunacy, which office I occupied for 10 years, I was for nearly 7 years in the governor's office in New York and had charge of the criminal business; that is, the extradition of fugitives and looking after criminals generally.

Q. (By Mr. KENNEDY). May I ask you if you have any information as to whether that large percentage from Ireland is assisted from the other side or more largely from this side by relatives and friends?—A. I could not answer that. Of course I think we all appreciate this fact, that owing to the unfortunate conditions which prevail in Ireland, there are more of these people there; but this happens right along, that when people come over from Ireland or from any other of those countries and become a little bit prosperous, they immediately try to bring their friends over here. They are exceedingly clannish—I have observed that—much more so than our own native population. They seem to care much more for their own people, and they will save money and put forth efforts, and make sacrifices which, I feel safe to say, would not be made by the native-born people. It is astonishing how

they get those people over here. I can conceive in some instances perhaps—in fact I feel pretty confident that in England that was the case, certainly for a number of years—deliberate efforts were made, fare was furnished, transportation was given for those people to come. The fact remains that that is the condition of things.

In regard to the cost of caring for those people, to show what an enormous thing this burden is, and how, I believe, it is worthy of the most serious consideration that this honorable commission can give it, we have, for instance, a net increase in the State of New York of 700 per year. Half of that is foreign-born population, just one-half of it—in other words, 350 a year. It is known, so far as anything can be known, that the average duration of life of the insane—that is, in an institution—we will not say anything about how long they have lived outside or how long they live after they get out—but the average length of time which they live after they get in is supposed to be about 12 years; and we will call it 10 years for convenience. Last year the fixed charges of caring for the insane were the lowest in the history of the State.

I might say here, as perhaps being germane to some of the questions that come before you on the value of co-operation, that in 1893, when the State consolidated all its hospitals for the insane under one charter, and had them operated from one central office, the average cost of caring for the insane was $222 per year. The first year that the commission had charge of the finances the cost went down to $187; and it has been dropping ever since, so that last year the average cost of caring for the insane in New York dropped down to the unprecedented low figure of $165. As compared with 1893, say—that is, in round numbers—a saving of nearly $60. That would mean a saving to the State, on a basis, say, of 20,000 insane, of $1,400,000 a year. That has been brought about by co-operation. I am not here in behalf of trusts, but I just simply desire to say a word showing what can be accomplished by intelligent, well-directed, centralized effort—what has been accomplished in one direction in the State of New York.

Q. (By Mr. CLARKE). And at the same time you claim they have been very much better cared for than before?—A. I can say this, that it is said by competent judges that the system of caring for the insane in New York is the finest in the world. I venture to say that you gentlemen could not be any better entertained than to visit one of the hospitals for the insane in the State of New York and see how these people are cared for. They are comfortably clothed, they are well fed, they are kept warm, they are supplied with trained nurses; there is not a hospital that has not a training school; they are given the best medical attendance that can be had; the recovery rate is rising constantly; and all that has been brought about with a constantly diminishing rate of expenditure. Why? Simply by co-operation. The State has now in round numbers a dozen State hospitals. In the old days when it had six, or seven, or eight, each of these institutions was governed by a board of trustees and each was going independent of all the others. They never compared notes; they never visited each other's institutions; their own methods prevailed. Every two months, in the State of New York, each superintendent of a hospital meets in Albany in consultation with the commission, and all these questions of finance, of medicine, and of internal management are discussed. The purchase of supplies on joint account has been extensively introduced, so that, as I say, while the standard of care has enormously improved, the rate of expenditure has enormously decreased. But even taking it on the basis of $165 a year, if these people live 10 years—and that certainly is the lowest estimate; my own judgment is that it is more than 12 years, but for practical purposes we will say it is 10 years—there is $1,700, saying nothing about the rate of interest. The credit of the State of New York is very high, as the credit of all the States is to-day. The State of New York can borrow money for about three per cent. If you add the interest charge, it will bring the cost to the State up to about $2,000 during that period.

Then you must consider the cost of erecting all these vast buildings. In the old days, Major Farquhar, I used to live in Buffalo myself, and we both recall the Buffalo Hospital for the Insane. That institution when it was put up, in the days when it was desired to do something for the district, cost nearly $4,000 per capita for every lunatic in there. Of course it was a magnificent structure. Its towers I will not say are quite as high as the Washington Monument, but it is a magnificent structure. And that sort of thing went on for years, so that the State of New York has to-day invested in public buildings for the insane in round numbers $20,000,000.

Coincident with the passage of the State care act, the legislature, as the result of frequent investigations, numerous scandals, charges, and bickerings, etc., became satisfied that the ratio of expenditure was too great and they limited the Lunacy Commission in buildings to $550 per capita, and that is the rate to-day, which includes furniture, fixtures, and everything that goes to make up the institution. Now, how long those buildings will last is a question. I was looking over, several years ago, a statement by the National Fire Underwriters and, as I recall it, they determined that the life of a brick store building was about 20 years. If you put up a brick store building and did not make a dollar's worth of repairs on it, in 20 years the building would fall down, would be destroyed. In other words, you have practically got to expend what the building would cost in an ordinary structure. Now, I use this illustration of the brick store building because I think it more nearly corresponds to the class of buildings they put up for the insane, all ordinary structures. If we assume that in 20 years the buildings would have to be duplicated, and if we assume the life of a lunatic is 10 years, why it costs for buildings for each lunatic $275.

Q. (By Mr. PHILLIPS). Do you think that is a fair estimate of the brick building? Are not a great many of those torn down in order to erect larger ones, which would not be the case with an insane institution? A very large per cent of the buildings that are 20 years old are supplanted by larger and better buildings.—A. If I recall it correctly—I gave a good deal of study to it at that time—that estimate was confined to the ordinary building which simply was allowed to live out its course. That is, if they were going to pay a loss they would figure as to what it would be worth on that basis of depreciation. That is my general recollection. At any rate, of course, the cost of caring for buildings for the insane obviously must be much greater. A certain number of them are destructive. I said awhile ago that the number of destructive insane persons has diminished, and that is true. In the old days they would tear a building practically to pieces in a few years. Of course, as they employ more people, that is diminished to a very large extent, but even to-day they are a destructive class of people. And if we assume that $275 would represent the cost of a building for each person, you have to add that to your $2,000; you have to add interest to that; then on top of that you have to take the appropriation for expenses of the central administration to add to this amount. The maintenance of the State Lunacy Commission at Albany with its great force of employees, with its machinery for sending these people out of the State into other countries, etc., all that aggregates a large amount of money; you have to add that to it. Then, as I say, the interest charge on these buildings and the interest charge on all these other things has to be added; so that I should say that $3,000 per lunatic would be a very conservative estimate.

We figured out, so far as the State is concerned, a few years ago, in the case of native-born insane, the loss to the State by reason of the insanity of persons during the 12-year period. Horace Mann, away back 40 years ago, figured out that the average earnings of each inhabitant of the State amounted to at least $150 a year. That is probably much higher to-day. I have not gone into the subject, but even taking his figures, in 10 years the earnings lost by reason of one lunatic would be $1,500. We figured it out at that time that if we took earnings into consideration, interest, buildings, and all those things, it would amount to about $6,000; but for the sake of being conservative on that question, we might cut that rate in two and say $3,000. We have 350 a year of foreign-born people admitted into these institutions. They live 10 years at the rate of $3,000 a piece, and you can multiply that $3,000 by 350 and see what you get—in round numbers you get $1,000,000.

Q. (By Mr. KENNEDY). For the State of New York alone?—A. For the State of New York alone. Now, mind you, that is going right along indefinitely; and unless the United States Congress, through the medium of such a commission as yours, can provide some remedy for this evil it will require more figures than we could put on this table here to see where this will end.

Q. (By Mr. CLARKE). Have you studied our immigration and the practice at the barge office in New York with reference to a diminution of this evil?—A. Only in a general way. I was going to speak of that a little bit later. I have never visited the barge office, but, of course, we know something about it. We are to-day, of course, caring for over 5,000 people in excess, according to our figures, of what is the normal percentage in the State of New York. In other words, we have got over 50 per cent—11,000 of these people who are foreign born, whereas, according to the foreign-born population in the State, we should have only 5,000 or between 5,000 and 6,000. It already runs into millions and millions, and it will run into millions and millions more; it is a vast thing. I am not prepared here to-day, for instance, to give the figures in regard to the idiots and epilepties; but I might say in this connection, although I am not charged especially to do so, that the State of New York has assumed practically the care of all the epileptics in the State; it has assumed practically the care of all the idiots; and then when you come to take into consideration the prisons of the State, when you come to take into consideration the vast number of reformatories, its houses of refuge, its various charitable institutions, why, the figures simply reach an appalling size. As I say, I am simply interested in this question of the insane.

Now, we get down to the practical question why the Lunacy Commission was charged with the duty of deporting persons who belonged to foreign countries. The insane are a very difficult class to deport. For instance, you take the average paupers, and they are shifted about from one city to another by the purchase of a railroad ticket; they are generally ready to move on if anybody will give them a ticket. But you can not do that with a lunatic; as a class they are difficult; and it is especially difficult to send them back to Europe. I think, in round numbers, they send out of the State to other States and foreign countries about 168 a year; a large number of them—I think about 100—are sent to foreign countries; sent back, and the others are distributed to other States.

Q. (By Mr. PHILLIPS). How are they cared for in being sent back; what provisions do you have for them?—A. I am very glad you suggested that. The policy of the State Commission in Lunacy—we do not claim to be any more moral than other people, but as a matter of sound public policy when the State of New York assumed the entire care of the insane and when all this was placed under charge of this commission, a commission which could be held directly responsible, three men, by the legislature and by the public, it was felt that it would hardly do to tolerate certain practices which had theretofore existed by the local authorities. Now, I will not go into the cases and mention the States, but I know of instances after instances—I can recall one State in particular that makes it a

regular practice to send an agent around to its hospitals for the insane like this: They come across a patient and say: Where did you live before you came here? I lived in New York. Got any friends there? Yes; oh, yes. Like to go back there? Very glad to. Well, I will see if I can fix it. They literally gather up those patients, take them to a railroad station, buy them a ticket, give the train men half a dollar or a dollar and say, If you will kindly look after this patient until he gets to the Grand Central Depot you will confer a favor. Now, what happens? They are dumped out at the Grand Central Depot and go out on Forty-Second street, and the police see them wandering around, and they are taken to the police station and examined and found to be insane, and taken to the receiving pavilion, kept under detention for a week and committed to the State hospital. Then the State of New York has to begin to get those persons back; and, of course, the question of domicile is a difficult one to determine, especially in cases of that kind. So that they are constantly pouring into the State of New York, and ultimately they drift and gravitate from the State of New York to other States for various reasons. Of course the State has always been willing, and I would not undertake to state that we had been entirely free from guile; but we never have taken a poor, helpless lunatic and put him on a train and paid anybody for doing it. If we have sent anybody out of the State, we have always sent a trained attendant and made arrangements beforehand with friends and relatives to take care of him.

Q. (By Mr. CLARKE). Do you send any out of the State unless you have reason to believe that their proper domicile is in the State to which they are sent?—A. No; and the most careful investigation will not show one instance since the State Commission in Lunacy has been organized. We have considered it a matter of sound policy not to do that, because we would have difficulty the minute we did it. We have had difficulty. For instance, here is a patient whose husband has gone to some other State and is employed there, and perhaps we have sent an agent to go and see him, and if he has expressed any desire to have her back, or found any friends, why we send her back. Now, that is an easy matter, comparatively speaking, to get people back between the States, although we are trying to get certain legislation in Congress to cover that question; but, as I conceive it, that does not interest you. The trouble in regard to sending insane to foreign countries is a serious one. Now, the immigration laws provide substantially—and I will not burden you with going into details at this moment—that if it can be shown that an immigrant becomes insane within one year from the time of his arrival, from causes which arose prior to his departure for this country, he can be shipped back at the expense of the steamship company. That is one provision of the statute. You can see how exceedingly difficult that is to establish. It is hard work to say who drew that law or at whose instance it was drawn. We find that the superintendents of the State hospitals in New York—they are all conscientious men, and if they were not conscientious men, good men, no man with any professional reputation would be willing to make out a certificate that any lunatic became insane from causes which arose prior to his departure for this country. They simply can not get at it. Of course, an alienist studying the history of one of these cases might very well come to the conclusion that the causes arose more than a year before he came here, but not by the most remote possible stretch of the imagination could he certify to it satisfactorily. In some cases they refuse outright to do it; in others they do it very grudgingly; but unless that certificate is made the steamship companies refuse actually to take them.

The United States statutes provide, among other things, as I recall them, that if a person becomes dependent within one year he may be sent back at the expense of the Immigration Bureau. Now, the State has gone a little further than this; we have sent people back as far as Japan—that is a rare instance—I do not recall but one case; we did send a Japanese back who came over here to study for the ministry, became insane, and was in our hospitals for two or three years; and through correspondence we found that his friends were willing to receive him, and we paid the expense and sent a trained nurse with him to Vancouver; and it cost the State $500. But we regard it as cheap to do that and the State was willing; and the State could afford to-day to pay out $500 for every lunatic to get rid of them.

Q. In sending them abroad do you compel them to leave the State or just make amicable arrangements?—A. Oh, we have to make amicable arrangements. There is no way by which we can compel any lunatic. They are usually willing to go, they are usually glad to go, but then comes the difficulty of arranging the matter with the steamship company, and that is what I want to speak of here—those cases, of course, where they are obliged to return. That is a very difficult thing to establish, a difficult thing to get that certificate, and difficult in every way. And even when we are willing and the person is accompanied by a trained attendant—for instance, there is one woman in the employ of the State who speaks several languages who is constantly traveling back and forth between this country and Europe taking these people home. The State would be willing in every case to furnish a trained attendant to take the person back, but while the State is willing to do its share, if the steamship company knows it, it will not receive a lunatic on board, no matter how harmless or how quiet or how well attended; so that the State or the agents of the State have to resort to various petty, minor artifices to get rid of these people.

Q. (By Mr. KENNEDY). Is that because of regulations in the ports on the other side?—A. No; I think not. The steamship companies simply object to having a lunatic on board; they are afraid of them; they do not know

exactly what will happen. Of course, as a matter of fact, any person who is accustomed to handling lunatics is no more afraid of them than they are afraid of a sane person. They are very tractable in the hands of a trained person, and the State always pays second cabin and sends over a very competent person, and sometimes by various arrangements they succeed in getting them on board; sometimes they are refused absolutely.

Q. (By Mr. PHILLIPS). They are compelled to take them back if they have not been here over a year?—A. Yes; they are compelled to take them back, as I have pointed out.

Q. Then who provides for them?—A. The steamship company.

Q. They provide the nurse?—A. No; I do not know what they do; we simply deliver them. That is a thing which I think might very well interest this commission, because I imagine the suffering and hardships of those people must be very great when they are transferred back under those circumstances. Of course, all the State does is simply to take them down to the Barge Office; it is arranged by the immigration authorities. The number of those cases is very small, because it is a very difficult thing to establish that a person became insane from causes which arose prior to departure for this country. Now, it does seem to me that some provision should be made whereby if the State desires to return lunatics or other dependent persons to a foreign country the steamship company should be obliged to take them, if they are properly accompanied. I do not think any State would object to that.

Then, again, this question of a year. Now, that is altogether too short a time. You take the history of those people. They come over here, even the very poorest of them, perhaps with a little money. They may have the promise of employment, and it may be pretty nearly a year, and often is, before this malady begins to develop. After money is gone and after employment ceases and loss of friends, etc., despondency ensues, a case of melancholia results, and the consequence is that a year elapses before the disease becomes apparent. We believe that that time should be extended.

Q. (By Mr. FARQUHAR). How much extension?—A. I should think it should be extended to two years; I think that would be a reasonable time.

Q. Why should you not make your extension to cover citizenship? These people are not citizens of the United States.—A. Not at all.

Q. You mentioned it simply as an arbitrary term?—A. That is all. We should prefer to have that time very much extended. I mention two years as the shortest time. Of course you would have to adopt some arbitrary period, I conceive. I mention two years as the shortest time.

Q. (By Mr. LITCHMAN). Would you not also in that connection adopt a regulation that in case they became insane they should be deported anyhow, without reference to this examination that you speak of to show that the primary cause existed at the time of the immigration from the foreign country?—A. I do not think that would be an unreasonable thing at all. I think that question you ask is a very pertinent one, and I say it for this reason: A very elaborate system of records is kept. For instance, when a hospital is notified that a person is ready to be received, a trained nurse goes to get this person. They are not only trained in that particular, as to the care of the insane, but they are trained in regard to the question of issuing the certificates; and they take long blanks and they question the relatives and friends, because the history is a very important thing in relation to the care of a case. We find in almost every instance where the history can be known that heredity plays a very important part. It is wonderful. On the records of the wards of the State of New York I have seen grandparents and grandchildren. I have seen as many as two sisters at a time. It is not an uncommon thing to see two brothers and sometimes three sisters. I do not mean to say that that is very common, but it occurs, and it only points out that heredity plays a very important part in this matter.

Q. Is that heredity manifest more in the female than in the male?—A. I do not think there is any difference. Experience shows in New York, and I imagine almost everywhere, that the sexes are almost equally divided. There is a slight excess as to women, but I attribute that entirely to the fact that women are more tractable. When the question comes up about their commitment, if they go, they do not make any resistance as a rule.

Q. Have you investigated the question as to the age at which insanity manifests itself?—A. Why, as I recollect it, it manifests itself more particularly between 30 and 45.

Q. That applies to both sexes?—A. Applies to both sexes. I desire to say that I am not a physician. I am simply a lawyer, representing the legal end of this commission; but, of course, I acquire some information, some knowledge, which a physician perhaps could only be expected to know. But that is generally the case. In other words, you find very few young people, you find scarcely ever a child in these institutions.

Q. Do you find any special cause for the insanity manifested?—A. That would be difficult.

Q. That would be a physician's answer?—A. That would be a physician's answer. Of course, in round numbers, in generalizing you might say that heredity is the most important cause, if you are pleased to call it a cause. Then comes in the question of intemperance and excesses of various kinds. Take a person who has a heredity of insanity, of a grandparent or a parent, there is insanity in the family. That does not mean that that person

would inevitably become insane; but it does mean that there is a predisposing cause, and if that person goes through life in a temperate way and in a fairly prosperous way, and is not given to drugs and narcotics, the chances are that that person will not become insane. But if any of these things happen, loss of employment, or loss of influence or misfortune, he very often will. Now, we know that most of these immigrants that come over here—I think it is safe to say that most of them are from the very poorest class. They have lived on a low diet, the poorest diet, and they have suffered great hardships, and they are very much more prone to become insane than any other class. I think that explains that.

Q. (By Mr. FARQUHAR). Do you omit in that the continuous marriage of kin?—A. No; I think it would include that, because I think that is very well recognized. But there are numberless causes which enter into this thing.

Q. (By Mr. LITCHMAN). Of course this question may not be properly put to you as a lawyer, but more properly to a physician, but how near in consanguinity may marriage safely take place?—A. Well, I should draw the line at cousins.

Q. Not nearer than that?—A. Not nearer than that.

Q. First cousins or second cousins? Would you have the marriage of own cousins?—A. Well, I think it has been generally thought even in that case that the results are very bad and that there ought to be a wider margin. That is my general recollection and impression—that you ought to have more margin.

Mr. FARQUHAR. If you will go back, Mr. Brown, to the question of sending these people back under the immigration laws, I think it would help your testimony somewhat to quote into it sections one and eleven of the immigration law of 1891. It would make your testimony more complete. Just look over it a minute—the excepted classes and the deportation clause.

The WITNESS. I did not intend, I might say here, to go into this subject so generally. I will read section 11 of the law of 1891, approved March 3, 1891. [Reading.]

"Section 11. That any alien who shall come into the United States in violation of law may be returned, as by law provided, at any time within one year thereafter, at the expense of the person or persons, vessel, transportation company, or corporation bringing such alien into the United States; and if that can not be done, then at the expense of the United States; and any alien who becomes a public charge within one year after his arrival in the United States from causes existing prior to his landing therein shall be deemed to have come in violation of law and shall be returned as aforesaid."

Now, as I say, I would amend that section by extending the time. I should say that the limit of time should be two years. I should also strike out "from causes existing prior to his landing therein," because that is a thing which possibly can not be found out practically. It could only be known by a very elaborate investigation.

Q. (By Mr. FARQUHAR). Now, to the inhibited classes named in the first section would you add any others so as to make it more of a drag net?—A. The first section of this act says [reading]: "That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States, in accordance with the existing acts regulating immigration, other than those concerning Chinese laborers: All idiots, insane persons, paupers, or persons likely to become a public charge," etc. It seems to me that is a pretty broad section. Of course, to be more exact, they might put in the word "epileptic," for instance. I would amend that section by providing that if it could be shown or there was reason to believe—and of course the United States would have to determine that question, I take it—that the person was or had been an idiot—of course, once an idiot always an idiot. That might be said also in regard to epilepsy. It is practically an incurable disease. It could be said in regard to an insane person. I would absolutely exclude them if it could be shown that the person was an idiot or was an epileptic or had been insane for—well, we will say 10 years—because it is known—I have known of instances and you perhaps have known of instances—where a man has been insane for a while and recovered, and the disease has never recurred. I think it would be a hardship, if a person had had no insanity for 10 years, to exclude him, but I certainly would put a time limit on it. A person who has been insane once will be almost certain to be insane again unless the conditions are exceedingly favorable. Therefore I would exclude those persons absolutely; that is, if it is the policy of this Government—and I presume it is—to exclude defective and undesirable persons. I would say they were a very undesirable addition, and I would exclude them without reference to whether they had property or not.

Q. You would include epileptics in the excluded class?—A. I certainly should.

Q. Would you use the expression "weak-minded" to cover other classes?—A. That is a very troublesome question. For instance, we had an immense amount of difficulty under the constitution of New York. The Lunacy Commission's jurisdiction was cut off from idiots. Now, legally, an idiot is a person without a mind. An idiot may be born as such—that is, without a mind—or it may be a case of arrested development. For instance, a child may live for six months or a year and it may have scarlet fever or some other disease and practically the mind be destroyed. Now, there is much dispute between alienists as to whether that person is an idiot, and the State has had considerable difficulty in framing a suitable definition. But I would include imbeciles. There is a distinction

between an idiot and an imbecile. That is a word that may be used with perfect safety. An imbecile may be known. If you go to the idiot asylum at Syracuse or the institution at Newark for feeble-minded women, you can see the distinction between idiots and imbeciles and persons of weak minds. I think that such legislation as that could be safely, and should be, provided.

Q. How full are your statistics in New York as to those aliens that have come under that law concerning lunacy?—A. You mean as to what country they come from?

Q. Yes; are they very full and go back for several years?—A. Yes. We could furnish them back to 1890.

Q. Can you furnish also the statistics of deportation?—A. Oh, yes. Of course, in some instances it is very difficult to find out the private history of these people, but every effort is made, and I think that could be furnished.

Q. (By Mr. PHILLIPS). Have you ever gone into the question of insanity among the uncivilized—for instance, the North American Indians—and whether older nations are not more liable to have their subjects become insane than newer ones?—A. No; not especially. We have some Indians.

Q. You have some insane Indians?—A. Yes; but there are very few Indians in the State of New York, and it would be very hard to generalize, the number of Indians we have is so small; but in regard to the old countries—I suppose you are referring to China and Japan—it would be practically impossible to get any information that would be of any real value in regard to the matter. It is astonishing how much of inaccuracy there is in regard to statistics. Now, I undertook to go into one of our neighboring States—one of the most highly civilized—to find out about the cost of maintaining the insane, and I found it necessary for me to make a special study of their institutions to find out anything about it. The methods were so entirely different.

Q. Have you studied in regard to the proportion of insane to the population in England, Ireland, France, and Germany, as compared with those in the United States?—A. Our figures would show that. Of course, in New York and in other of the Eastern States the whole thing is vitiated by the fact of this stream of immigration; and there is another thing: We put down a person as native. Here is a family that comes into this country and a child is born a few days after arrival; that child has to be put down as a native, and yet, practically it is foreign born to all intents and purposes.

Q. (By Mr. FARQUHAR). Have you found in your investigations that any organizations or municipalities or smaller subdivisions of states in Europe do deport their insane to this country?—A. It is only on information and belief. We never have gone to the extent of going over there and thoroughly investigating it.

Q. Do you recollect the report made by a special commission in 1891 that went all over Europe and reported that in Switzerland and England, and especially Ireland, they deported many of their insane and imbeciles to this country?—A. I recall that.

Q. Do your later investigations show there is anything of that now at all?—A. We do not know, except there are certain earmarks which indicate that thing is being done. We do not know it to a certainty.

Now, as to the remedy, outside of this matter of legislation: I might say the Lunacy Commission had a bill introduced in both Houses of Congress a year or two ago on this very subject. We should like to get that legislation if we could, and we would like to get the support of this commission in regard to it.

Q. What was your proposed law to cover?—A. Substantially the lines we have discussed.

Q. Was it an amendment to the immigration law or a separate law itself?—A. It was an amendment. It was prepared and introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator Fairbanks on May 2, 1898; it was an amendment to the act of 1891.

Q. What is the form of the amendment?—A. Shall I read it?

Q. Yes; if you please.—A. (Reading:)

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section one of the act of March 3, 1891, in amendment of the immigration and contract-labor acts, be, and hereby is, amended by adding to the classes of aliens thereby excluded from admission to the United States the following:

"All persons who have been confined in an asylum for the insane, or have been insane before landing in the United States, or who shall within two years after arrival in the United States become insane, unless it shall affirmatively appear on special inquiry that such insanity is due to causes arising after such arrival."

Of course that covers substantially what we have been talking about. [Reading:]

"Section 2. That section one of the act of March 3, 1893, to facilitate the enforcement of the immigration and contract-labor acts of the United States be, and hereby is, amended by adding to the statements which are now required in the lists or manifests in answer to questions at the top of said lists statements as to each immigrant, 'Whether ever insane or confined in an asylum for the insane.'"

Q. Adding just one question?—A. Just one question. [Reading:]

"And section two of said act is hereby amended by adding after the words 'insane persons' in said section the words 'or been insane or confined in an asylum for the insane.'"

That covers substantially the same ground. Section three of this proposed bill provides that [reading]:

"Section 3. That every alien immigrant landing in the United States furnish to the inspector of immigration a certificate of a surgeon of the immigrant's last place of residence, showing whether such immigrant has ever been insane or confined in an asylum for the insane, or whether either of the parents of such immigrant was ever so confined, accompanied by a certificate of a consul or consular agent of the United States, in the same State, province, or country, that such surgeon is a qualified and practicing surgeon thereof.

"If such certificate is not furnished, the inspector of immigration shall, with the medical examiner or examiners, make careful inquiry as to the matters required to be shown by such certificate, and if it shall appear that a parent of an immigrant who is permitted to land has ever been insane or confined in an asylum for the insane, the fact shall be reported by the inspector of immigration to the superintendent of immigration.

"Section 4. That any alien or foreign-born insane person in the United States, whose return to a foreign country from which he migrated is not now provided for by the immigrations acts, but whose return may be voluntarily had upon the request of the family or relatives of such insane person or other persons in interest, shall, upon the demand of the superintendent of immigration or of a State board or officer having charge of the insane in any State, the furnishing of the necessary attendant or attendants and the payment of the regular fare of the persons carried, be transported to the country from which such insane person migrated to the United States by any steamship or transport company, or owners of vessels doing business between any port of the United States and any foreign port in the line of travel to such foreign country. And any company or owners violating the provisions of this section shall pay a fine not exceeding $500, to be recovered in the proper United States court, and said fine shall also be a lien upon any vessel of said company or owners found within the United States.

"Section 5. That this act shall take effect three months after its passage."

This bill I recall now, upon reading it. I have been out of office nearly two years, but when this bill was prepared of course I was very familiar with it. I certainly think that would be a very wise provision, and I do not see how any great hardship could be worked out. If it could be shown that any person contemplating migration to this country had been insane, it does not seem unreasonable to say that that person should not be admitted here. I think the United States could go a great deal further. I never was down to the Barge Office, and do not know what the system of inspection is, but I do say this: If the exclusion of these people could be predicated upon the determination of the fact, even to be ascertained on this side, that the person was of the defective class—an idiot, insane person, or epileptic—it would be worth to the State of New York alone any sum of money. The State could afford—to say nothing of the United States—to keep at every port one or two trained alienists to examine these people as they come. Now, the manifestations of degeneracy, if you please, are so striking in most instances, that any expert would know it instantly.

Q. (By Mr. CLARKE). Is it your opinion that a person who has been insane could be detected ordinarily by one or two physicians when that person might pass in line before them?—A. No; I think in many instances that they might escape observation, but I think in a large number of instances it would be perfectly apparent; that the manifestations of physical degeneracy would be so apparent that it would result in their being set aside and detained for a further inquiry. That is what it would result in.

Now, it is very curious. These alienists, trained men with experience, can detect certain manifestations of the eyes and the ears—you might say of the face. I have watched these physicians in a hospital; they would have the person cross his legs and then strike a sharp blow with the hand below the knee. What that sign is I can not recall, but I have seen it done repeatedly, and it is certain to show a certain—you might say a nervous lesion—if I use the expression correctly. Now, I believe that might be done, and I do not believe with the large number that is admitted here it would be any great hardship. It is certainly the case that these people are coming here in vast numbers, and I certainly think that legislation should be obtained somewhat on the line of this bill.

Q. (By Mr. FARQUHAR). It is also a very expensive class of immigration?—A. Very; the most so. For instance, the inmates of our workhouses and reformatories, and the epileptics and insane are capable of largely supporting themselves. The insane are at work some, but their working is only an incident to their cure and treatment. They are only given that amount of work which will benefit them. You can see the enormous number of employees. I stated it as one to five; my recollection is it is greater than that—between four and five—approximately one to five.

Q. (By Mr. KENNEDY). I would like to ask one question about something you said in regard to the people of a certain country. You said, I believe, that 25 per cent of the population of New York was foreign born, and 50 per cent of the insane were foreign born, and that about 40 per cent of that 50 per cent were Irish.—A. That is the general impression that I have.

Q. General impression? You think there can be no question about that?—A. I do not think there is much.

Q. Is it not a fact that the Irish are generally a pretty hardy and healthy race, and you do not look for insane people among them?—A. The trouble about that is this: I apprehend that the thrifty Irish largely do not come

over here—that is, they have not in the early days and to this time. They naturally come over here to better their condition, and they come over here as a result of severe poverty. In other words, we might apply the same thing here. If emigration were to take place from this country, only those would go whose condition had become desperate by reason of great hardship, poverty, etc. I believe it to be the case that these people live largely on a low diet. I believe it to be the case that the Irish are peculiarly prone in this country to tuberculosis—peculiarly prone to it. I think, without stating it as a fact, that statistics will show that that race is taken off more rapidly by tuberculosis than any other class. As to tuberculosis, I might mention here what Dr. Trudeau told me in the Adirondacks. I had quite a long talk with him, and he said that the germs of tuberculosis existed everywhere. He said, "You are just as liable to get it in Albany as here. Everybody breathes the germs, but if a person is in excellent physical condition, the germs pass right through and do no harm, but if persons are in a low physical condition—if their diet has been poor and they are run down, disease readily attacks them." And I certainly think that is so in regard to the Irish. Their climate is a severe one, as I understand it; it is moist.

Q. You would not find many predisposed to insanity among the police force of New York City?—A. They are a picked class.

Q. Picked from the Irish class, too?—A. Generally from that race, but the hardy ones are picked out.

Q. (By Mr. CLARKE). Have you studied the subject of intemperance among immigrants as a cause of insanity?—A. No; except that we know in a general way that intemperance plays an enormous part in this thing. I think it is generally true. For instance, take the English, I think intemperance is much greater over there than it is here. That is my impression. I think that is so among the Irish; but I would not speak with any authority on that subject.

Q. (By Mr. PHILLIPS). You say the larger per cent of the foreign-born insane are from Ireland. If we now had statistics of the number of insane in Ireland and England in proportion to the number of inhabitants, and from some of these other countries, we might find that their per cent may be much larger; and that therefore we are not getting so many shipped in on us as there would seem. Is there any way to do that?—A. I see what your point is. In New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Massachusetts—in fact, all the Eastern States—the ratio of insane persons to the whole population is pretty nearly constant. The last time I looked at it it was about one to 300. As you go farther West you will find it grows less and less until you get out in the far Western States, where the proportion runs to as high as one in 1,500.

Q. The conditions surrounding the American people are different?—A. Of course it is different. The tendency is with these people to go into the Eastern States when they come into the ports of Boston, New York, or Philadelphia. The number has been so great that there is in the Eastern States one lunatic to every 300 of population. I do not know what this last census will show, but that was the condition when I looked at it last. When they migrate and go West it is only the hardy ones that go. The same rule does not seem to apply here as applies when they come from the foreign countries over here. Only the hardy ones go to the Western States; they leave the feeble and defective ones behind them here. So you get a proportion out there so small that you might practically say there are no lunatics at all out there. I still think—no matter what the statistics might show in Great Britain, Ireland, Germany, and France—I still think vast numbers of these people could be kept out.

Q. Do you not think there is a greater per cent of these in the old nations, where they are thickly populated, compared with America?—A. I should think so. I do not know how many of you have ever undertaken to look through lunacy reports, or the reports of Great Britain, that we concede to be about the most highly civilized country across the water; and yet I should say, to the most expert man it would be impossible to take their reports and figure out anything satisfactory. That is because they have no centralized administration. Take it in London—it is one of the most confused things. There is the county council, the borough of this and the borough of that, and they do not seem to have any responsible head there anywhere. So it is almost impossible. And then they allow far greater numbers of their affected people to roam at large. In the State of New York it could not ever be known with any certainty how many lunatics there were. We know of instances, all of us, where there are people who should be committed, but out of sentiment and considerations of humanity, mistakenly so-called, no steps are taken to lock them up. I think that condition prevailed much more generally in the old days. I meant to have brought that out more fully. It was true in the State of New York just as long as the insane were a municipal, or county, or town charge, and had to pay the State a certain rate per week, they were unwilling or reluctant to commit the people. They said, "Let this crazy Mary wander around. We will have to pay $4 a week for her board, and we can care for her in the poorhouse better and more cheaply." That ceased to operate the minute that the State took hold of it. They saw that they were relieved of local taxation, and said, "We might as well get this person out of the poorhouse." So the State now has them all. But the benefit has been such that the people recover quicker now, get cured quicker. And, in spite of the fact of all these people being brought in, the number appears to be diminishing.

Q. (By Mr. FARQUHAR). The whole expense in New York comes out of the general fund?—A. Out of the

general fund. The $250,000 which is now received goes into the treasury, but it is a general State tax. I want to emphasize the fact that the State of New York has ceased to treat the question as a matter of charity, but simply as a matter of the highest financial consideration.

Q. (By Mr. PHILLIPS). Do you admit persons to the insane asylum whose people are able to support them?—A. They have to be admitted.

Q. Do you not charge it up to them?—A. The State has seven or eight agents, whose duty it is to investigate all of these cases. For instance, in the city of New York an agent stands there at the receiving pavilion, where the persons are brought for preliminary examinations, and if it is found there is anybody liable for their support, they are charged with it. But to show the poverty-stricken condition of these people it is only necessary to point out that the State receives less than $300,000.

Q. Out of the $5,000,000?—A. Out of the $5,000,000. Of course, this may be said, that the policy of the State of New York to-day is not to pauperize the family. For instance, here is a mechanic whose wife becomes insane. He may be earning $2.50 per day. He has three or four children to care for and has to hire a housekeeper. To make that man contribute the average cost of support, $3.50 a week, would cut into his wages so as to impoverish the family. So the State says, "We will remit this charge." We had the criminal procedure amended a couple of years ago extending the liability to brothers and sisters and husband and wife.

Q. It stops with the immediate family?—A. No; it takes in everybody in the order of their relationship; brothers and sisters would come first. The liability of parents always continues. The liability of the husband always continues. The liability of the wife always continues, and the other relatives in point of order.

Q. Down to cousins?—A. As a practical question I do not think they ever pay.

Q. They have compelled brothers and sisters?—A. Yes; but if the State chose to exercise its power it could bring these people into court under our amended criminal procedure and have a judicial order made establishing their liability. But in spite of all that to-day they only get about 1 in 16.

When you come to get the statistics of Germany or England—I will not speak of France, because their government is much more centralized—I think they would only show approximately the number of insane in proportion to the population. Under our census, of course, that would be a matter of opinion—the number of insane persons outside of institutions. The census taker would have to form his own judgment as to whether a person was insane. He would have to guess at it. Naturally relatives are very reluctant to make any admission. They have an idea it casts a stigma and interferes, perhaps, with the marriage of sons and daughters. They are very reluctant to admit anything of the kind.

Here is a thing that happens, and it seems to me there ought to be some remedy: We will say here is an immigrant that starts here from way back in some interior port—away from the coast. The steamship company, when it returns him, simply deposits this person right at the point of departure and leaves him. Now, I conceive that there ought to be some provision made for these persons being sent back to the place they came from. It has led to an immense amount of difficulty and hardship.

Q. (By Mr. CLARKE). Would not that be a matter for foreign determination, or to be provided for by treaty provision?—A. Perhaps. I leave it with you, gentlemen, if they undertake to return them, whether they should not send them back to the point of original starting. Of course, as a matter of fact, I think they purchase tickets right through.

Q. I would like to inquire if your insane in New York are employed in any productive industry?—A. Yes. If you are interested, I could say a word about that. Of course, labor on the part of the insane in New York is only an incident. It is simply with reference to their cure. In other words, no lunatic is permitted to labor except practically on the certificate of the physician. The State seeks to make no profit out of them. It simply employs them for their own benefit. But, as a matter of fact, in the last few years all the shoes used in these institutions and all the clothing is made by them; all the hats and caps—I won't say all, but practically all. Then the State has gone into the business of making its own soap: has a finely equipped factory at Rochester, where all the soap is made. They simply employ one soap maker, and the patients assist him. They make all the soaps used, even the shaving soap. At Utica all the coffee is taken there and ground and distributed, and all the spices.

Q. You mean all the supplies for the various insane hospitals or for other State institutions?—A. Confined absolutely to the hospitals for the insane. Of course the other institutions have sought to get the privilege of buying their own coffee. We used to pay 25 cents a pound, the average wholesaler's price, for coffee up to about three years ago. Now this coffee is bought directly by the broker from the importers, taken to Utica and roasted, cleaned, ground, and distributed, and it is simply a matter of bookkeeping. The actual cost is taken into consideration and it is distributed according to that cost, and to-day it is billed to them at 11 cents. It is so fine that the officers drink it on their tables. I venture to say if you would drink a cup of that coffee you would say you never had better coffee in your life.

Q. Are any goods produced for the general market?—A. No; not a dollar.

Q. That is prohibited by law, is it not?—A. I do not know that it is prohibited as far as the hospitals are concerned, but in the penal institutions it is. They carry out that rule to such an extent that a warden is not allowed to be shaved by a convict. But, so far as the hospitals for the insane are concerned, they manufacture their own supplies, and they are distributed from one point to another.

Q. I suppose there are farms connected with some of the hospitals?—A. Yes. Every institution in the State of New York has a farm; and that is a very interesting thing, that question of the running of these farms. We found, when we came to go into the matter from a financial standpoint, that in some instances it would be better to abandon the farms altogether and buy everything than to undertake to operate them. We found that on their balance sheet they showed a profit. Of course they would give themselves credit for the milk and for the hay, and give themselves credit for the corn that the hogs ate and also for the pork; but when we came to analyze their accounts and charge it on a proper basis we found that about half of them paid the State and the State more than got its money back, and that the remainder of them were bankrupt. So that led to a reorganization. None were absolutely abandoned, because it is an advantage to keep a certain number employed. Generally speaking, we found that the old methods of agriculture were not the best. The State in some instances has farms amounting to 1,000 acres. Willard and Binghamton each has a farm of about 1,000 acres. We found that the raising of the ordinary farm products, such as are commonly raised in the East, were financially a failure. So we instructed the people to turn the farms as far as possible into market gardens, and we began to raise immense quantities of asparagus and fine fruits and raspberries, gooseberries, and all sorts of fruits of that kind. In some cases they have three or four acres in strawberry beds. At one time when I was at Utica the patients were gathering 1,000 quarts of strawberries a day. Those were things the State could not afford to buy. We used to give these people a certain amount of fruit, but we could not, of course, begin to do anything like what we ought to do; and when we turned these farms into fruit gardens and market gardens they began to pay. The State could not compete in raising corn and barley and oats and rye with the West. The things were laid down in our market at a cost much less than the labor; but the moment we began to raise small stuff it began to pay.

Q. You raise these garden products for the general market?—A. No; simply for the insane. We used to purchase it.

Q. Do not sell anything?—A. Do not sell anything. But of course it was much more valuable. You take an acre of asparagus and compare it with an acre of corn as to value, and you will see what a difference it will make. Of course that would diminish the amount of meat we would have to give them. Of course they raised vast numbers of hogs. That is something we gave a great deal of attention to. In the old days the hogs used to die off and the herds were destroyed every year or two. Right here I should say that we employed Professor Atwater, of the Wesleyan University at Middletown, Conn. He has been employed for two or three years in working out a dietary for the insane, finding out by experiments and observations the class of food used, and seeing what foods could be substituted for the present food and what waste could be prevented. In his preliminary report he showed to us beyond the cavil of a doubt that at least 25 per cent could be saved on the food supplies alone. Now, the State of New York is doing all these things, and yet in spite of all this and an enormous reduction in expenditure the number is piling up at a fearful rate.

Q. (By Mr. KENNEDY). Do the hospitals of the State of New York use any of the products of the inmates of the penal institutions of the State?—A. Yes; I should have spoken that.

Q. I want to ask in that connection if that has had any effect on the marked reduction in the cost of maintaining the convicts you spoke of?—A. I should say not. I want to say a word about that. When the constitution prohibited convict labor the legislature, in carrying out the provisions of the constitution, among other things, provided that the convicts should be employed solely in the manufacture of articles for the use of State institutions and for the use of the political divisions of the State. On that basis the penal institutions have been making furniture and clothing and all sorts of things, and to a certain extent they have the convicts employed, but only partially so. The amount of stuff they can turn out is so great, compared to the consumption of the State, that they can keep these people employed only a part of the time.

Q. Through labor-saving machinery?—A. Yes. The act provided that the hospitals should pay the State a price which should be as near as possible the market price. The State has found it can go out in the market and buy a better iron bed, for instance, than the State can make, and for a lower price. You can go down to Wanamaker's store, and buy a better iron bedstead than the State can make, and at a less price, and buy at retail. Of course there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction in regard to that.

Q. Does it cost the State a good deal less now?—A. No. There are two forces at work. The prison system wants to be as nearly self-sustaining as possible, and they claim that they only charge for the goods they turn out what the goods could be obtained for on the outside; but that is a question. I notice they charge the State more generally than the same article can be bought for outside, but they are supposed to pay the same.

Q. (By Mr. FARQUHAR). Does not the State get the whole of the convict's labor that is in the iron bedstead,

or pair of shoes, or school bench, or desk? If you had to pay an outside mechanic for doing that and you do not pay your convict for doing it, is it not a saving for the State?—A. Not very much. The difficulty is with convict labor and the way it is applied. It is applied under such peculiar conditions. The overseers or assistant labor is such a heavy element in the cost that large numbers of them are practically without free labor. I do not know that you could say their labor was worth one-fifth what the labor is outside. It is worth very little.

Q. (By Mr. LITCHMAN). Do you know that of your own investigation?—A. I know it from an investigation I made at the time. We looked into it pretty carefully. When I was a member of the Lunacy Commission our object was to keep down the cost of running the hospitals; and they would often charge us for bureaus, bedsteads, and various articles prices which we believed to be in excess of the market prices. They took the ground: Here is all this labor that goes in. We call our labor worth so much a day, and it takes us so many days' labor to produce these articles. My answer was: I do not care what it costs you. You can not charge us for those beds more than the beds can be purchased for in the open market. That is your loss. The price charged in the regular market is so much.

Q. The price charged in the regular market is the compensation to the State for the labor of its convicts, is it not?—A. That is all.

Q. Now, if it is charged to your department, it becomes a part of the expense of managing the insane, does it not?—A. Yes, it would.

Q. Then in the last analysis there is a saving to the State, is there not?—A. Possibly there would be.

Q. It is simply a matter of bookkeeping?—A. Possibly it is a matter of bookkeeping, of course, affecting the labor question. Years ago I used to know considerable about it. The difficulty is that all these people come in there untrained and with no trades. There is not one man in a hundred that has a trade, and they only work comparatively few hours a day, and there are certain rules and regulations in there, and they have to have a great many trained employees over them. They tried to have convicts trained, but that did not work.

Q. Is it not true that the convict in the prison learns as much of a trade as the workman outside of the prison?—A. Under the present management I should say that he learned a good deal more than he used to. That was one of the evils of the old contract system that I was opposed to when I had something to do with the prisons. For instance, they used to have great stove contracts at Sing Sing. They used to do more than one particular thing, but when they got into the prison they never did anything else; a fellow would stay in prison for five years or 10 years, and he would be an expert driller, or an expert polisher, but he would not learn a trade. Of course, when they started in with this new scheme they said, Here, we will teach these people trades as distinct from making them mere laborers. Now, that would be an excellent idea; and my own judgment is, of course, that we are branching out into other things, and that it would pay every State in this Union to teach these people in these prisons trades.

Q. Even if it did cost a little more?—A. Even if it costs a little more.

Q. (By Mr. FARQUHAR). Is not there a proposed amendment now coming before your present legislature to make it hand work, the same as Pennsylvania?—A. I presume likely. Of course the labor people look at it as competition, and they are looking after it. An iron bedstead from the prison standpoint would cost ten times more if they undertook to do it by hand.

Now the best managed penal institution in the world, so far as I know, is the reformatory at Elmira. The very last thing I knew anything about it they had in round numbers 40 different trades, and a fellow actually was taught bricklaying. They had fellows learning the trade of stone masons, blacksmithing, and barbering, and when a man went out into business he had a trade. Run on that basis, the State ultimately will get a return, because when they go out they have some occupation to turn to and be useful; and having an occupation, in my judgment, would diminish crime in this country more than anything else.

Q. Have you noticed statistics of the State of New York in the last two years since this bill came into operation? What is the difference between commitments now in penitentiaries and reformatories and before this went into operation?—A. The diminution of crime in the State of New York has been enormous in the last three or four years.

Q. (By Mr. CLARKE). That might be owing to the general prosperity, might it not?—A. Well, good times have undoubtedly affected it some, and of course better police supervision and better education; the people know more than they used to. There are some county jails in the State of New York that practically haven't got an inmate.

Q. (By Mr. FARQUHAR). Is it not a fact, since the enactment of that law in the State of New York, that there is not any inducement for a justice of the peace, or a judge of a municipal court, or whatever court may have jurisdiction of that small class of crimes, to convict and send anyone to the penitentiaries or to the reformatories?—A. I think so.

Q. It does not pay now to send any?—A. No.

Q. Constantly diminishes?—A. Diminishes. But if I had my say about it, if I was superintendent of prisons

of the State of New York to-morrow, I would turn every one of these prisons into institutions for teaching these people trades; I would wipe out every possible source—I think it has been wiped out legally—every source of profit. I would abolish, for instance, the fee system among petty officers; I would abolish the mileage system; I would remove all temptation. I believe it is the cause, not only in New York, but in the States generally, of numbers of instances where these people, for instance, are sent to various penal institutions for what there is in it.

Q. (By Mr. KENNEDY). We have testimony here to that effect.—A. That is my judgment, and I was connected with prisons indirectly for several years, and in fact I take great interest in prison associations in New York to-day. My views, however, have entirely changed in regard to that from what they were 10 or 12 years ago. I was in favor of the contract system, and at the time they tried to abolish it I was very much opposed to its abolition, but I believe it was a mistake.

Q. (By Mr. FARQUHAR). The only argument in its favor was revenue?—A. That is all.

Q. And it admitted of division of revenue among politicians?—A. No doubt about that at all.

I was just going to say in conclusion—I won't say that humanity and charity, that side of human nature, should be eliminated, but I do think that the sooner that our Government and our States come to recognize this whole question as one of sound financial policy, the sooner they will eliminate the difficulties with which they are surrounded; just as in the State of New York in regard to its care of the insane, which was regarded as a charity, and the question was to do or not to do, and we had a constantly increasing burden. The minute the State came to look at it as a business proposition, and endeavored to see what was best to be done, it began to succeed.

Q. (By Mr. LITCHMAN). Do you think the State management of the insane has eliminated to any degree the brutal treatment of inmates of institutions?—A. Practically it is impossible. I do not believe I have seen in a paper in the State of New York—I can not recall a single instance where a matter of that kind has been mentioned. It used to be a common thing, and the reason why it has been discontinued is that the State employs more people; their tenure is secure. In the State of New York both parties by common consent leave the hospital for the insane outside of the domain of politics. There is not a political party in the State that pretends to interfere with the appointments of attendants or nurses. The whole thing is under the civil-service regulations, but outside of that there is no sentiment in favor of it.

Q. What State inspection is there?—A. None whatever. The Lunacy Commission is held simply and solely responsible, and they are subject to removal by the governor on charges.

Q. Do you know how often inspections are made by that Commission?—A. They are required to visit each institution at least twice a year. As a matter of fact, they are visited more often; every inmate has an opportunity of being heard, etc.

Q. (By Mr. CLARKE). Coming back to this question of the financial aspect in the management of the insane, have you any statistics showing the diminution of the cost?—A. Yes; we can give you the statistics as to the cost of caring for the insane in the State hospitals. When you come to the State of New York, for instance, in the counties of New York and Kings, which include Greater New York, nobody on earth knows what it formerly cost to care for their insane, because their figures were constantly juggled. The cost of caring for the insane in the poorhouses was inextricably mixed. For instance, the care of the insane and the care of the paupers were together; but when we came to aggregate the whole thing we found that the cost became diminished; it became diminished so far as the State institutions were concerned. It went down from $222 to $165 last year.

Q. Is it not possible to get statistics from some of the cities, or counties or towns, which will show that this State assumption of the cost of maintaining the insane has been economical to them in the respect that it has diminished their local charges?—A. That brings up the great question of taxation. It is a curious thing. Now, for instance, we can only approximate what it cost the city of New York and the county of Kings to care for their insane. We know what the figures were, but we know that the figures are very much less; that is, they juggled with them. Some years they included the buildings, and in other years they struck them out. In other words, the city government of New York would make a favorable showing. They would juggle with those figures and we never could arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. Neither could we in the counties. Now, for instance, in some counties, in round numbers, it cost $2 a week to care for their insane. We found when we went to investigate it that it cost a great deal more to care for the insane than for the paupers, but to show what that difference was they kept no separate books; it was impossible to get at it.

Q. (By Mr. LITCHMAN). Do you have under your control the epileptic colonies?—A. No; that is under the control of the State Board of Charities. That is a new experiment on the part of the State. They are gathering up those people very rapidly, but there is a class that is perfectly hopeless, and the only thing you can do for them is to care for them properly. That is a disease that is practically incurable, as I understand it.

Q. You made a statement that the convict was worth about one-fifth as much as outside labor. That you do not know from any investigation of your own?—A. Not at all. That is a mere guess.

Q. I asked that because of an investigation by the legislature of Massachusetts showing under the conditions

then prevailing that the convict in the prison was worth about two-thirds as much as outside labor.—A. I should doubt that exceedingly.

Q. It was proved before that commission, of which I was a member.—A. Of course it would depend on what work they do; they might be employed in certain lines of work where they would be worth that much.

Q. But on the long-term men they were worth exactly as much, hour for hour, but of course their pay was very much less?—A. Here is a long-term man, for instance; he becomes expert in a certain trade. Now, you can say he produces as much under good conditions as the man outside, but then you have got to take into consideration what it costs to maintain that man—what it costs to operate that prison.

Q. That is not the point. The point I asked you was as to his comparative productive power compared with the outside mechanic.—A. For instance, here is a fellow who gets in for what we call a two-year term—that means one year and eight months; here is a fellow that gets in for five years—that means three years and seven months; here is a man that gets in for ten years—that means six years and six months. Now, there are lots of those convicts who do not really get into the harness before their term is out. Take the average hours of labor of those people, and the average production, and that is the only way you can get at it. When a man becomes expert in one thing he is suddenly removed, sent out, and a new man takes his place. Take the average hours with the average number of men right through and undertake to compare their productive labor with the things they ordinarily work at, I do not believe that my one-fifth would be so much out of the way.

Q. Our prisons were conducted in Massachussets at that time under the contract system, under which the labor was contracted out to private employers, who used exactly the same machinery in the prison as outside the prison, and the testimony before that commission was to the effect that the convict was worth about two-thirds as much as the outside man.—A. Well, I should doubt it.

Q. We got it from the manufacturers themselves, who were in a position to know.

(Hearing closed).

56TH CONGRESS, 2d Session. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. REPORT No. 2751.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS.

FEBRUARY 8, 1901.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, submitted the following

REPORT:

[To accompany H. R. 13605.]

The Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13605) to amend the immigration laws of the United States relative to the insane, idiotic, or epileptic, beg leave to submit the following report and recommend that the said bill be passed with amendments.

The object of this bill is to amend the immigration laws so as to more effectually exclude insane, idiotic, or epileptic persons.

The present statutes are not sufficiently effective to prevent the ingress at the ports of entry of the United States of the great excess of the above-described persons.

By the United States census of 1890, the native-born population was 84 per cent; foreign born, 16 per cent; native-born insane, 65 per cent; foreign-born insane, 35 per cent.

The percentages of the various States are as follows.

	NATIVE BORN.	FOREIGN BORN	NATIVE-BORN INSANE.	FOREIGN-BORN INSANE.
Arkansas	98.4	1.6	95.6	4.4
Alabama	98.3	1.7	95.2	4.8
California	69.1	30.9	41.1	58.9
Colorado	79.3	20.7	62.6	37.4
Connecticut	74.9	25.1	59.8	40.2
Delaware	90.6	9.4	78.8	21.2
Florida	90	10	86.2	13.8
Georgia	98.7	1.3	97.7	2.3
Idaho	79.3	20.7	63.4	36.6
Illinois	77.7	22.3	57.1	42.9
Indiana	93.3	6.7	85.4	14.6
Iowa	83	17	63.4	36.6
Kansas	89.3	10.7	71.5	28.5
Kentucky	96.9	3.1	88.4	11.6
Louisiana	91.2	8.8	80.5	19.5
Maine	88.2	11.8	88.9	11.1
Maryland	88.6	11.4	76.5	23.5
Massachusetts	70.4	29.6	61	39
Michigan	73.8	26.2	58.2	41.8
Minnesota	64	36	32.2	67.8
Mississippi	98.6	1.4	92.8	7.2
Missouri	90.8	9.2	71	29
Montana	66.9	33.1	39.5	60.5
Nebraska	80.8	19.2	55	45
Nevada	65	35	30.8	69.2
New Hampshire	80.8	19.2	87.6	12.4
New Jersey	76.5	23.5	58.6	41.4
New York	73.6	26.4	50.8	49.2
North Carolina	99.7	.3	99.1	.9
North Dakota	58	42	35.7	64.3
Ohio	87.2	12.8	72.4	27.6

	Native Born.	Foreign Born.	Native-Born Insane.	Foreign-Born Insane.
Oregon	81.6	18.4	60	40
Pennsylvania	83.6	16.4	67.9	32.1
Rhode Island	68.6	31.4	60.6	39.4
South Carolina	98.7	1.3	94.9	5.1
South Dakota	72.2	27.8	49.9	50.1
Tennessee	98.5	1.5	96	4
Texas	91.3	8.7	82.8	17.2
Utah	74.4	25.6	38.4	61.6
Vermont	86.7	13.3	84	16
Virginia	98.2	1.8	94.2	5.8
Washington	73.9	26.1	52	48
West Virginia	97.5	2.5	90.4	9.6
Wisconsin	69.2	30.8	44.4	55.6
Wyoming	75.1	24.9	57.9	42.1
District of Columbia	87.9	12.1	53.5	46.5

The State of New York, on whose behalf the proposed legislation is asked, is perhaps more vitally interested than any of the other States with few exceptions. Nevertheless, the question generally affects every State in the Union in a greater or less degree. It will be noted that with one or two minor exceptions the percentage of foreign-born insane is more than double the percentage of the foreign-born population.

To illustrate how seriously this affects the well-being of the whole country, it is only necessary to point out that there are in the New York State hospitals for the insane over 22,000 inmates, one-half of whom were foreign-born, or an excess over the percentage of population of 5,500. The cost of buildings alone for this excess insane population is over $5,000,000.

The average duration of life of the insane is more than ten years, and the average cost to the State of each insane person, including food, clothing, medical attendance, nursing, repairs to buildings, interest on investment, etc., is more than $3,000 each for the whole period of ten years. The average net increase of the insane in New York each year is more than 600, one-half being foreign born, and is one-quarter in excess of the foreign-born population of the State. The annual burden, therefore, thrown on the State of New York each year amounts to more than a sum of $3,000 multiplied by 150, or a gross burden each year of $450,000. Each period of ten years represents a sum amounting, with interest, to about $5,000,000.

In the country at large there is an excess of foreign-born insane over the foreign-born population of 16,000, and at the rate of cost of $3,000 for each person there would be a loss in the whole United States of nearly $5,000,000 per year. In the period of ten years considered the loss would, of course, amount to a sum greater than $50,000,000.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO EXISTING STATUTES.

The act of March 3, 1891, is amended by excluding those who have been confined in an asylum for the insane, idiotic, or epileptic before landing in the United States. The present law simply excludes those who are at the time of landing insane, idiotic, or epileptic.

The bill extends the time within which insane persons must be returned who have become insane after arrival from one year—the present law—to two years.

The present law requires the return of an insane person within one year if it can be shown that the insanity, etc., was the result of causes which arose prior to departure. This bill requires the return of an insane person within two years, unless it can be shown that the insanity, etc., is due to causes which arose after arrival in this country.

The bill provides for an amendment of Section 1 of the act of March 3, 1893 (Chap. 206), so that lists or manifests will show whether a person has ever been insane or confined in an institution for the insane.

This bill provides that every alien immigrant landing in the United States shall furnish to the inspector of immigration a certificate of a medical officer of experience in the treatment of mental diseases, showing whether such immigrant has ever been insane or confined in an institution for the insane, or whether the parents were ever so confined, accompanied by a certificate of a consul or consular agent that the medical inspector is a qualified physician of experience.

This bill provides that steamship companies shall return any insane person upon the payment of fare at any time, even though two years have elapsed, if accompanied by attendants at the request of any State which may have made arrangements for such return, and provides a penalty of not exceeding $500 for a refusal. There is now no provision by which a steamship company can be compelled to take a lunatic, even though fare is paid and the lunatic is properly accompanied and the return is sought by a State where relatives in a foreign country desire the return of such lunatic.

The committee recommend that Section 1 of the bill be amended by inserting after the word "who" in the eighth line, the words "within ten years;" and in line 10, after the word "who" "having been admitted."

56TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION.

H. R. 13605.

[Report No. 2751]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

JANUARY 16, 1901.

MR. O'GRADY introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and ordered to be printed.

FEBRUARY 8, 1901.

Reported with amendments, referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

[Insert the part printed in italics.]

A BILL

To amend the immigration laws of the United States relative to the insane, idiotic, or epileptic.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section one of the Act of March third, eighteen hundred and ninety-one, in amendment of the immigration and contract-labor Acts, be, and hereby is, amended by adding to the classes of aliens thereby excluded from admission to the United States the following:

"All persons who *within ten years* have been confined in an asylum for the insane, idiotic, or epileptic, or have been insane, idiotic, or epileptic before landing in the United States, or who, *having been admitted*, shall within two years after arrival in the United States become insane, idiotic, or epileptic, and public charges, unless it shall affirmatively appear on special inquiry that such insanity, idiocy, or epilepsy is due to causes arising after such arrival."

SEC. 2. That section one of the Act of March third, eighteen hundred and ninety-three, to facilitate the enforcement of the immigration and contract-labor Acts of the United States, be and hereby is, amended by adding to the statements which are now required in the lists or manifests, in answer to questions at the top of said lists, statements as to each immigrant, "Whether ever insane, idiotic, or epileptic, or confined in an asylum for the insane, idiotic or epileptic;" and section two of said Act is hereby amended by adding after the words "insane persons" in said section the words "or been insane, or confined in an asylum for the insane, idiotic, or epileptic."

SEC. 3. That every alien immigrant landing in the United States furnish to the inspector of immigration a certificate of a medical inspector of experience in the treatment of mental diseases of the immigrant's last place of residence, showing whether such immigrant has ever been insane, idiotic, or epileptic, or confined in an asylum for the insane, idiotic, or epileptic, or whether either of the parents of such immigrant was ever so confined, accompanied by a certificate of a consul or consular agent of the United States in the same State, province, or country, that such inspector is a qualified physician of experience in the treatment of mental diseases. If such certificate is not furnished, the inspector of immigration shall, with the medical examiner or examiners, make careful inquiry as to the matters required to be shown by such certificate, and if it shall appear that a parent of an immigrant who is permitted to land has ever been insane, idiotic, or epileptic, or confined in an asylum for the insane, idiotic, or epileptic, the fact shall be reported by the inspector of immigration to the superintendent of immigration.

SEC. 4. That any alien or foreign-born insane person, idiot, or epileptic in the United States, whose return to the foreign country from which he migrated is not now provided for by the immigration Acts, but whose return may be voluntarily and lawfully had upon the request of the family or relatives of such insane person, idiot, or epileptic, or other persons in interest, shall, upon the demand of the commissioner of immigration or of a State board or officer having charge of the insane, idiotic, or epileptic in any State, the furnishing of the necessary attendant or attendants, and the payment of the regular fare of the persons carried, be transported to the country from which such insane person migrated to the United States, by any steamship or transportation company, or owners of vessels doing business between any port of the United States and any foreign port in the line of travel to such foreign country. And any company or owners violating the provisions of this section shall pay a fine of not exceeding five hundred dollars, to be recovered in the proper United States court, and said fine shall also be a lien upon any vessel of said company or owners found within the United States.

SEC. 5. That this Act shall take effect three months after its passage.

[COPY.]

WASHINGTON, February 26, 1901.

BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION,
No. 25,722.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Sir—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22d inst., inclosing copy of H. R. 13,605 and report thereon, requesting the views of this Department on the legislation contemplated by this bill.

In response thereto you are informed that the purpose contemplated is one that meets with the entire approval of the Department, but upon an examination of the bill itself it was obvious that certain amendments should be made and as a simple method of indicating them an interlined copy is herewith returned. The amendments indicated are of a practical nature, as you will see by a reference thereto, and it is hoped that they may meet with your approval.

Respectfully,

(Signed) L. J. GAGE, *Secretary*,

T. V. P.

R. K. G. F. H. L.

Here follows bill with amendments suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury—new matter in italics—matter to be stricken out in brackets.

56TH CONGRESS,
2D SESSION.

H. R. 13605.

[Report No. 2751]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

JANUARY 16, 1901.

Mr. O'GRADY introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and ordered to be printed.

FEBRUARY 8, 1901.

Reported with amendments, referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

[Insert the part printed in italics.]

A BILL

To amend the immigration laws of the United States relative to the insane, idiotic, or epileptic.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section one of the Act of March third, eighteen hundred and ninety-one, in amendment of the immigration and contract-labor Acts, be, and hereby is, amended by adding to the classes of aliens thereby excluded from admission to the United States the following:

"All persons who *within ten years* have been confined in an asylum for the insane, idiotic, or epileptic, or have been insane, idiotic, or epileptic before landing in the United States, or who, *having been admitted*, shall within two years after arrival in the United States become insane, idiotic, or epileptic, and public charges, unless it shall affirmatively appear on special inquiry that such insanity, idiocy, or epilepsy is due to causes arising after such arrival."

SEC. 2. That section one of the Act of March third, eighteen hundred and ninety-three, to facilitate the enforcement of the immigration and contract-labor Acts of the United States, be and hereby is, amended by adding to the statements which are now required in the lists or manifests, in answer to questions at the top of said lists, statements as to each immigrant, "Whether ever insane, idiotic, or epileptic, or confined in an asylum for the insane, idiotic or epileptic;" and section two of said Act is hereby amended by adding after the words "insane persons" in said section the words "or been insane, or confined in an asylum for the insane, idiotic, or epileptic."

SEC. 3. That every alien [immigrant] landing in the United States furnish to the inspector of immigration a certificate of a [medical inspector] *physician* of experience in the treatment of mental diseases [of] *at* the [immigrant's] *said alien's* last place of residence, showing whether such [immigrant] *alien* has ever been insane, idiotic, or epileptic, or confined in an asylum for the insane, idiotic, or epileptic, or whether either of the parents of such [immigrant] *alien* was ever so confined, accompanied by a certificate of a consul or consular agent of the United States in the same State, province, or country, that such [inspector] *physician* is [a] qualified [physician] *by* experience in the treatment of mental diseases *to make such certificate*. If such certificate is not furnished, the inspector of immigration shall, with the medical examiner or examiners *assigned for duty at the port of entry of said alien*, make careful inquiry as to the matters required to be shown by such certificate, and if it shall appear that a parent of an [immigrant] *alien* who is permitted to land has ever been insane, idiotic, or epileptic, or confined in an asylum for the insane, idiotic, or epileptic, the fact shall be reported by the inspector of immigration to the [superintendent] *Commissioner-General* of immigration.

SEC. 4. That any alien or foreign-born insane person, idiot, or epileptic in the United States, whose return to the foreign country from which he migrated is not now provided for by the immigration Acts, but whose return may be [voluntarily and] lawfully had upon the request of the family or relatives of such insane person, idiot, or epileptic, or other persons in interest, shall, upon the demand of the *Commissioner-General* of immigration or of a State board or officer having charge of the insane, idiotic, or epileptic in any State, the furnishing of the necessary attendant or attendants, and the payment of the regular fare of the persons carried *by such State board officer*, be transported to the country from which such insane person migrated to the United States, by any steamship or transportation company, or owners of vessels doing business between any port of the United States and any foreign port in the line of travel to such foreign country. And any company or owners violating the provisions of this section shall pay a fine of not exceeding five hundred dollars, to be recovered in the proper United States court, and said fine shall also be a lien upon any vessel of said company or owners found within the United States.

SEC. 5. That this Act shall take effect three months after its passage.

STATE-PAID LOBBYIST AT NATIONAL CAPITAL

Lunacy Commission Sent Goodwin Brown to Washington.

Legislators May Ask for Facts About Supplies Scandal—Ramsperger Bill to be Withdrawn.

Special to The New York Times.

ALBANY, April 8.—Although the State of New York is represented in Congress by thirty-seven members, the State Commission in Lunacy considered it necessary to send a lobbyist to Washington at the last session of Congress to push legislation in which it was interested and pay him $2,500 for his services. The man chosen for this mission was ex-Commissioner in Lunacy Goodwin Brown, and the bill which he went to Washington to advance was to provide for the deportation of alien lunatics who come into the port of New York.

The money to pay Mr. Brown was deducted from the allowances made by the State to the hospitals, each hospital being assessed according to the number of its patients. The provision of law under which it is claimed the action of the commission was authorized is Section 39 of Chapter 26 of the Laws of 1902, which reads:

"Any general expenses necessarily incurred by the commission for or on account of the State hospitals shall be apportioned to such hospitals on a basis of the number of patients and included in the estimates of such hospitals, made as provided in this section under the direction of the commission."

T. E. McGarr, Secretary of the commission, when asked for the facts in connection with Mr. Brown's appointment, furnished copies of circular letters which he sent to the Superintendents of the hospitals on the subject. They state that the commission entered into an agreement with Mr. Brown by which he was to receive the sum of $1,250 if the bill was "materially advanced," and $2,500 if it became a law. He was paid $1,250 on Sept. 23 last for "materially advancing" the bill, and at the close of the recent session, when the bill had become a law, he was paid the $1,250 which had been promised him if that result were achieved.

The provision of law quoted under which the commission claims its action in paying Mr. Brown $2,500 for lobbying in Washington was justified is not a separate section, but the concluding paragraph of a long section referring to the expenses of the State hospitals. It has to do with the purchase of supplies for the State hospitals, and reading the whole section it would seem plain that the authority for the payment of general expenditures made by the commission was intended to apply to hospital supplies.

It is understood that some of the members of the Legislature who have information on the subject of Mr. Brown's appointment intend to air the whole matter in open session. They are of the opinion that the commission unduly stretched its authority in Mr. Brown's employment as a lobbyist.

Senator Ramsperger of Buffalo is seriously thinking of asking for the recall from the Governor of his bill creating a Treasurer and Purchasing Agent for the State hospitals. He now says that he introduced it without a thorough understanding as to what it would accomplish. He received it from Commissioner Lockwood of Buffalo and thought it was all right. He conferred with Senator Grady about it to-day and Senator Grady advised him to ask for its recall.

Secretary McGarr when questioned yesterday as to the action of F. A. Wheeler, the purchasing agent of the Manhattan and Long Island Hospitals, in entering into a contract with the Geneva Preserving Company for canned peas for the hospitals of the State, said that the only way in which Mr. Wheeler could get authority to take the action which he did was for all the stewards to designate him to act in the capacity of purchasing agent for them, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Wheeler in his letter to the Hospital Superintendents said that he was acting with "the consent of the Commission in Lunacy."

Mr. McGarr said that he was confident that Mr. Wheeler must have had the proper authority from the stewards.

Mr. McGarr was asked to-day to produce from the records of the Commission in Lunacy the resolution of the stewards empowering Mr. Wheeler to act as State purchasing agent for them. The only document which he was able to find in connection with the matter was the following:

Purchasing Stewards' Department,
New York City, March 8, 1903.

State Commission in Lunacy, Albany, N. Y.:

Gentlemen: Referring to my telephone conversation of to-day in regard to the gallon peas and to your confirmation of my purpose to accept a like quantity of last year's contract, at the same price, on the identical quality, I have this day written to the Geneva Preserving Company making them an offer of that kind, which is in accordance with their proposition to me of Feb. 21. If accepted I will notify you later. Respectfully.

F. A. WHEELER,
Purchasing Steward.

It is evident, therefore, that the sole authority which Mr. Wheeler had to act as purchasing agent for the State hospitals was derived from the Lunacy Commission, which concededly had no warrant in law to grant such authority.

In this connection it may be interesting to recall that the President of the Commission in Lunacy is William L. Parkhurst of Canandaigua, the town from which Senator Raines, the leader of the Senate, hails, and that Mr. Wheeler is Mr. Raines's brother-in-law.

When Mr. McGarr was asked what the amount of the canned peas contract was, he referred the interviewer to George D. Sandford, the Auditor for the State hospitals, as being more familiar with that branch of the subject. Mr. Sandford said that the contract was for $2,747, and the price paid was at the rate of $3.50 a dozen cans. Mr. Sandford admitted that it had been made without the formality of advertising or of competition.

"We always buy canned goods in the Spring of the year," said Mr. Sandford, "because we can do better. Last Spring Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Mosher, the steward of the Oneida Hospital, undertook to make an examination of various kinds of canned goods with a view to making the best contracts possible for the State hospitals. They made examination of canned corn, canned peas, and other canned goods and having satisfied themselves what was the best article offered, they made contracts to have the State hospitals furnished with the necessary supply."

"Were these contracts let after competition?"

"They were let as the result of the examinations which these gentlemen made. I myself was present when the Geneva canned peas were examined, and I will say that they were the best peas offered to the State in my experience, and the price was the lowest which could be obtained for peas approaching their quality."

From the admissions made by Mr. McGarr and Mr. Sandford it is clear that Mr. Wheeler has been acting as the purchasing agent for the State Hospitals by the consent of the Lunacy Commission; that he has entered into a number of contracts for supplies, and that, in several instances at least, there has been no competition, but the quality of the goods furnished and the price to be paid for them have been left to Mr. Wheeler's judgment.

The only defense set up for this irregular proceeding is that the supplies purchased by Mr. Wheeler have been of good quality and that the price paid was reasonable.

KEEPING OUT INSANE IMMIGRANTS.

Those members of the Legislature who have begun an investigation of the State Commission in Lunacy for what they call its unwarranted expenditure in sending an attorney to Washington to secure legislation for the exclusion of insane immigrants have made a false start. The authority for this expenditure is not to be found, as the investigators have stated, in that section of the law which relates to general expenses for hospital supplies. It is an authority specifically given in Chapter 380, Section 6, of the Laws of 1900: "The commission may endeavor to secure legislation from Congress to provide more effectually for the removal of alien and non-resident insane, and may expend a reasonable sum therefor from the monies appropriated for the use of the hospitals."

It may, perhaps, excite surprise that the Commission in Lunacy should send to Washington a special representative instead of trusting the matter to some one of the thirty-seven Congressmen from this State. Sensible men, however, will be likely to conclude that in choosing for this service Mr. GOODWIN BROWN, who has himself been a Commissioner in Lunacy, rather than in asking a New York Congressman to charge himself with the duty, they were wisely guided. It was a special service, and it was necessary that the argument should be made by some person having special knowledge, which Mr. BROWN certainly has. Moreover, it is perfectly evident that the act of 1900 contemplated precisely what the commission has done.

Mr. BROWN was in no sense a "lobbyist." That word is descriptive of quite a different order of public service. He appeared repeatedly before the committee having in charge the Immigration bill and presented the argument from the point of view of the New York Commission in Lunacy with such effect that the bill was in many respects amended to conform with his suggestions. As passed at the recent session of Congress it authorizes the exclusion of an immigrant who has been insane at any time within five years of the date of his arrival here; and persons who have been twice under restraint for insanity and all epileptics and idiots are also excluded. The time for deportation is by the act extended from one to three years from the date of arrival.

When we consider that there are 25,000 lunatics in the State of New York, and that while the foreign-born population is only 25 per cent. of the whole, 50 per cent. of the inmates of State hospitals are of foreign birth, it becomes evident that restraining legislation of this kind is needed. For years and years the European nations followed the easy practice of getting rid of their criminals by sending them to this country on emigrant ships. We put a stop to that practice as far as we could. They are still sending us their crazy folk. It is the intent of the Immigration act to put a stop to that practice also. Mr. GOODWIN BROWN'S labors were directed to that end, and his compensation of $2,500 was not excessive, and was paid, as any one can see, under authority of law.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF GOODWIN BROWN.

Dated June 1, 1908.

Goodwin Brown was born in Henderson, Jefferson county, N. Y., April 5, 1852, where his immediate ancestors settled very early in the century.

Mr. Brown traces his descent through sound Puritan lineage from the earliest period of New England history. His ancestors in the direct line on his father's side came from Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, England. They were particularly prominent in Colonial times, were very extensive landholders in Massachusetts not far from Boston, and the family was among the earliest benefactors of Harvard college. His ancestors were among the founders of Hartford, New Haven and Cambridge. None settled in New England later than 1638. One of them, John Hopkins, is said to have been a son of Stephen Hopkins, a signer of the Mayflower compact. The records show that they were all prominent in Colonial and Revolutionary periods and held conspicuous positions in military and civil life. One of them, Judge Joseph Hopkins, of Waterbury, Conn., earned the distinction of having been elected to the legislature of that State forty-four times in succession. He was also a prominent Revolutionary patriot.

Mr. Brown's education was begun at the Academy in the village of Mexico, Oswego county, N. Y., and was completed at Cornell university,

where he was class essayist two successive years. In college he was a member of the Psi Upsilon and Phi Kappa Psi Greek letter societies. In 1894 he was elected vice-president of the Albany Cornell Alumni Association. After leaving Cornell Mr. Brown engaged in business for a few years. In the fall of 1878 he removed to Buffalo. He was admitted to practice in the Supreme Court of this State in the spring of 1879, and in the United States Courts during the next year. January 1, 1883, Governor Cleveland appointed him pardon and extradition clerk in the governor's office—he being the second appointment by Mr. Cleveland as governor. Governor Hill reappointed him to the position on the beginning of his term in January, 1886, and again on the beginning of his second term in 1889. In 1889, upon the creation of the State Commission in Lunacy, Governor Hill appointed him as one of the democratic members. He was reappointed by Governor Flower in 1893 for a term of six years. The reappointment was bitterly opposed, and was delayed or hung up in the Senate for a period of three months by a senator the president of the board of trustees of the Hudson River State Hospital which had recently been investigated by the commission and was shown to have been grossly mismanaged. The investigation resulted in the immediate retirement of the superintendent of the institution.

While in the governor's office Mr. Brown was actively engaged in the preparation of laws relating to criminals and criminal procedure. In 1887 he brought about a conference of representatives of the various States and territories for a unifica-

tion and improvment of the extradition laws, rules and regulations, and was appointed by Governor Hill a delegate to represent the State of New York. Mr. Brown was secretary of the convention, and one of a committee to prepare a draft of a bill for presentation to Congress, providing for the regulation of the extradition of fugitives from justice. Mr. Brown was author of the law providing for the reduction of sentences of convicts for good behavior, which requires that in the case of a violation of the conditions of their discharge they shall be reimprisoned for the unexpired portion of their term; for the remission of fines in criminal cases; for revising the extradition statutes of New York, and providing that no person charged with crime shall be returned to another State unless regularly extradited; providing for the subpœnaing of witnesses and for the production of books and papers in pardon cases before the governor; providing that convicts be sentenced so that their terms shall expire during warm weather when the opportunities for employment are greater; requiring that all stenographers' minutes and all legal papers in all cases shall be transcribed and printed on paper of a standard size, in order to provide for the effectual preservation of court papers and documents; providing that no person charged with a crime punishable by life imprisonment shall be convicted upon a plea of "guilty."

He was author of the following laws while a State commissioner in lunacy: Providing for the appointment of women physicians in State hospitals for the insane; providing for a general scheme of fire protection in all public institutions supported wholly or in part by the State; for the erection

of outside iron stairways, in all hospitals in the State, public or private; providing for the appointment of a committee of a lunatic without the expense and delay of a jury, where the State is the petitioner—the constitutionality of this act was affirmed by the court of appeals on a test case in 1908. He also caused a bill to be passed to prevent the contracting by county authorities for the care and maintenance of the poor, and providing for the erection of free public baths in cities and towns of New York, in 1892, and in 1895, of the amendment to this act which makes the erection of such baths mandatory in all cities of the first and second class —Mr. Brown being the author of the first general state legislation on the subject had in the United States; of which act the Medical Record of New York City, Dr. George F. Shrady, editor, under date of June 22, 1895, stated that one of the two great acts for which the Legislature of 1895 should be entitled to credit was the act providing for the erection and maintenance of free public baths.

The first free public bath erected under this law was opened in the city of Buffalo January 1, 1897, in which a marble tablet was placed reciting Mr. Brown's services in procuring the passage of the act.

Mr. Brown's chief claim to recognition arises, however, by reason of his efforts together with his associate commissioners in behalf of the insane poor of New York. When the State Commission in Lunacy was created, there were 2,200 insane poor in the poorhouses of the State, most of them in a state of wretchedness, degradation and squalor which affords few parallels in modern history.

For years the efforts of philanthropic people had been frustrated through the selfish greed of county authorities who desired to retain the patronage and profits arising from the wretched county system of caring for the insane poor. Mr. Brown and his associates made a thorough investigation of the poorhouses of the State. Their discoveries were something appalling, and the recital of the wrongs, indignities, sufferings and cruelties, nay, of positive indecencies, were such in many instances that they were unfit for publication. Their report upon this matter submitted to the Legislature of 1890, afforded such an insight into the condition of the unhappy people in whose welfare the commission had become interested that the bill recommended by them was passed by a substantial majority although a similar measure had been repeatedly defeated in previous years, and an end was finally put to one of the greatest legalized scandals in the chief State of the Union. The act provided for the removal to State hospitals of all the insane poor in the poorhouses as soon as sufficient accommodations should be secured.

During the next year the commission recommended an appropriation of $454,000 to complete the work of providing additional accommodations. The money was voted without dissent, and the work of providing the buildings was at once begun. These buildings were completed prior to October 1, 1893. From that period all of the insane became wards of the State, wholly supported and cared for by appropriations made by the legislature, with the exception of the insane of the counties of New York and Kings. The Leg-

islature of 1895 provided for the care by the State of the insane of Kings county, and the Legislature of 1896, for the removal of the insane of New York county to the care of the State. Beginning with 1895, the system of special appropriations for the use of State hospitals was abolished by the legislature upon the recommendation of the commssion, and a general scheme of providing for a State tax for all purposes to be disbursed under the direction of the commission was established, power being given the commission to determine the quantity and quality of supplies and the price to be paid therefor in all of the State hospitals. These reforms were not brought about, especially those relating to the management of the State hospital for the insane, without bitter and untiring opposition on the part of the superintendents and the trustees in most instances. The commission, however, from the beginning was supported by the legislature and by each governor, so that the system established has become in all respects the leading one in the United States, if not in the world. During this period, the condition of the State hospitals was greatly improved, although the reduction in the expenditures under the management of the commission amounted to $300,000 per year, exclusive of the counties of New York and Kings. The Willard and Binghampton hospitals, which had been conducted as incurable institutions, were placed upon the curable basis and put upon the plane of the other State hospitals. This insured to all inmates the same high standard of care.

Among other reforms brought about by the commission was the establishment of the patho-

logical institute. Up to that time little or no attention had been paid to pathological work. There had been a faint attempt at the Utica State Hospital, but the work proved wholly ineffective. The commission suggested that a pathological institute be established for the benefit of the state hopsitals of the state, where the highest forms of scientific research work could be carried on. At that time there were no institutions of that character worthy of the name, and it was the idea of the commission to establish one on a firm and broad foundation that would not only permit of the highest development of scientific work in the state hospitals, but would also innure to the benefit of the state at large. The Legislature granted liberal appropriations for this purpose, and on the advice of the New York Academy of Medicine, Dr. Ira Van Giesen, one of the foremost pathologists of his time, was placed in charge of the work—the institute being located in the city of New York.

In 1894, the State Commission in Lunacy was made a constitutional body by a vote of 122 in favor to 18 against, thus placing the care of the insane directly under the control of the commission, and excluding the State Board of Charities from voice or control in this department of the State's charities. The constituiton was ratified by the people and went into effect January 1, 1895.

Mr. Brown was also active with his associates in reforming abuses in the private asylums, compelling the reorganization of all and revoking the licenses of those improperly conducted and providing for the appointment of properly educated and trained physicians, and placing all such

asylums on a common standard in ability to care for their inmates.

The press from time to time commented favorably on Mr. Brown's work as a member of the commission and his work generally in behalf of the State. Under date of October 2, 1893, the Utica Press said editorially:

"There has been very much said and very much done during the last few years looking toward the establishment of what has been commonly known as the system of State care for the insane. One of its objects has been to take from the almhouses of the several counties all the unfortunates suffering from mental malady and place them in State institutions where they may have the benefit of the best medical care and treatment with proper environments and surroundings. It has been a big fight from the first, and those favoring it have met with opposition from various interested sources, and have encountered obstacles which less courageous men would have counted insurmountable. With the first day of the present month the State care system enters upon its complete accomplishment. In this great movement the State Commissioners in Lunacy have been the leaders and of them the active, energetic, executive head has been Goodwin Brown, the legal member of that board. He has planned and supervised most of the legislation; and been its most earnest and best informed advocate wherever its policies were questioned, or its advantages denied. By hard and persistent fighting, convinced that his position was right, he has at length succeeded in bringing under central control and under one great system, the asylums for the insane of the

State providing for the proper care and maintenance of nearly ten thousand afflicted. While others have done a share of the work, its heaviest burdens and greatest responsibilities have fallen upon Mr. Brown, and the ability he has shown in carrying on and managing the thousand and one details of an immense undertaking is both remarkable and worthy of commendation. He has shown rare executive talents, with an earnestness and sincerity of purpose seldom equaled. Now that the system is fairly inaugurated his friends may pause to congratulate him, though his work is far from finished. He and his associates, Dr. Carlos F. MacDonald and Hon. Henry A .Reeves, have inaugurated and brought to this point a great undertaking, and there is every reason to believe that the same executive ability, so valuable thus far, will manage the myriad details of State care for the insane so that not only the interests of the patients will be served and advanced, but that the cost to the tax-paying public will be materially reduced. While all who helped are entitled to credit, the greatest share belongs to Mr. Brown, who all along has been the most active, energetic and industrious advocate of State care."

The results accomplished up to 1893, however, were only the beginning of the reforms affected by the State Commissoin in Lunacy. On January 1, 1894, Governor Morton came into office. Those who had opposed the policy of the Commission felt that at last they would have a friend in a Republican Governor and Republican Legislature, aud that the policy of centralization thus far carried out by the Commission would largely

be abrogated. Shortly before Governor Morton's inaugural, Mr. Brown was requested by Governor Morton to write that portion of his message relating to the insane and their care and treatment. The Governor stated to Mr. Brown that he would support any views which he might express. As a consequence the position taken by Governor Morton was followed by the Legislature and a still further extension of the powers and duties of the Commission was enacted. The Commission was given entire control, up to this time it having had only partial control, of the entire State Hospital system. From this time on, the opposition to the policy of the Commission absolutely ceased, and the State Hospital system was unified and consolidated, as it is known today.

In 1899 he was a democratic candidate for reappointment as State Commissioner in Lunacy. Governor Roosevelt was petitioned by nearly all the members of his party in the State Senate to appoint Mr. Brown, and although supported by leading philanthropists, judges, college presidents and great numbers of other prominent citizens of the State, the Governor sent in the nomination of a Republican which he was compelled to withdraw by the Senate. The State Senate then adopted a resolution calling on Governor Roosevelt for all of the papers referring to the application for the re-appointment of Mr. Brown. The Governor refused to comply with this resolution, except that he did send to the Senate all the papers in oppostion to Mr. Brown but none favoring his appointment. Mr. Brown's defeat for reappointment was clearly the out-

come of the bitter opposition which the Commission had experienced from the time of its organization. The result of Mr. Brown's application for reappointment was the rejection of the Republican candidate and the appointment of a Democrat which secured his party's approval in the Senate. On retiring from public life, the following resolutions were adopted by the State Commission in Lunacy, and the medical superintendents of the New York State Hospital for the Insane:

WHEREAS, After a service of ten years as a Commissioner in Lunacy of the State of New York, the Hon. Goodwin Brown has retired from the Commission, and it is appropriate that the existing Commission record its esteem of his work and administration; and

WHEREAS, The present admirable design and system of the official work of this department and of the State Hospital system is in large part due to the untiring efforts of Mr. Brown while a Commissioner, and is considered, by those best fitted to judge of its worth, worthy of the highest praise; and

WHEREAS, He was a chief factor in creating that memorable chapter in the history of lunacy in New York, known as the "State Care Act;" and

WHEREAS, Mr. Brown's services to the State in this regard present an illustration of the best political economics and offer a brilliant example of humanitarianism; having been always directed to the interests of the State, and never having overlooked the safety and welfare of the insane, for which the State Care act was created; now,

therefore,

Resolved, That, in the opinion of the Commission in Lunacy, on the retirement of Mr. Brown from the Commission, the State loses a valuable and conscientious servant; the insane, a persistent, benevolent and able advocate, and his former colleagues, a friend valued for his manhood, loyalty and the absolute courage of his convictions.

At a conference of the medical superintendents of New York State Hospitals, held August 1, 1899, the following resolution was unanimously adopted on the retirement of Goodwin Brown from the office of the State Commission in Lunacy:

Resolved, That in the retirement of the Hon. Goodwin Brown from the State Lunacy Commission, with which he had been identified as legal commissioner, in 1889, the State Hospital service has lost a faithful, zealous and efficient officer.

Resolved, That the medical superintendents in this conference assembled recognize the important part played by Commissioner Brown in the establishment of State care of the insane, as well as his skill and ability as an administrative officer.

Resolved, That Commissioner Brown's persistent and intelligent efforts on behalf of the dependent insane resulted in a general elevation of the standard of care throughout the State.

Resolved, That the medical superintendents are sensible of their loss in official fellowship, by reason of Commission Brown's retirement, and bespeak for him in private life a degree of prosperity and happiness commensurate with his conspicuous deserts.

During the period of his public service he was for several years a non-resident lecturer in the Cornell Law School.

On his retirement from the service of the State he resumed the practice of law in the City of New York, making Yonkers his place of residence. During the session of Congress of 1901 and for several following sessions he represented the State of New York in its efforts to secure legislation to more effectually exclude insane immigrants; appearing before the United States Industrial Commission and congressional committees. His work was successful in the session of 1903 when the Immigration Bill was passed, containing the restrictive provisions which he had for years labored. The president of the American Medico-Psychological Association, Dr. G. Alder Blumer, in his address at Washington, D. C., May 12, 1903, referring to this legislation, spoke of Mr. Brown as follows: "As *amicus curiae* it has been ex-Commissioners Brown's privilege to render our entire country a high order of public service in the role of catholic publicist, by giving effective testimony on this subject at repeated hearings before the Industrial Commission of Congress."

At the conclusion of Mr. Brown's successful efforts in securing a modification of the Emigration Law, he recommended to Governor Odell the appointment of a Board of Alienists who would work in conjunction with the Emigration Commissioner at Ellis Island in order to more effectually exclude undesirable emigrants. The Governor recommended this Legislation and a Board of Alienists was established by the Legislature.

Subsequently the United States Government refused to admit the Board to its grounds. Mr. Brown was then employed by the State to adjust the difficulties, and secured the admission of the Board of Alienists to assist in the examination of emigrants.

In 1902, at the request of the Yonkers School Board, he addressed to it a communication on behalf of baths in the public schools which was soon followed by their installation.

In 1894, he was appointed a Democratic member of the Yonkers Board of Health, and was elected President of the Board although a minority member. He was subsequently re-elected three times having been re-appointed by the Mayor of the succeeding administration. During his administration, the Board amended the Sanitary Code by adopting regulations regulating the building of tenement houses so as to secure more air and light and restricting the amount of space which could be occupied by such buildings. The practice of employing nurses during the summer months to care for the babies of the poor was inaugurated. During the first year of his administration the number of prosecutions for violations of the Sanitary Code prosecuted was raised from two to three thousand.

In 1906, he was appointed by the State to revise and consolidate the statutes referring to the insane.

In 1906, the State Lunacy Commission placed in all the State Hospitals pictures of the members of the First State Commission in Lunacy, of which Mr. Brown was a member, and ordered to be placed beneath these pictures the following

inscription:

"During their administration and upon their recommendation the state care act was passed in 1890; the insane in county asylums and poor houses were removed to state hospitals; the state system was unified and consolidated and the laws governing the insane and institutions for their care and treatment were revised and codified."

In November, 1907, as a result of the financial disturbance, several banks went into liquidation, and on the recommendation of the superintendent of banks, receivers were appointed for many of these institutions, Mr. Brown being named by the Supreme Court as receiver of the International Trust Company of New York City. This appointment was wholly unsolicited and was not known to him until some time after it was made. The appointment gave such satisfaction that the receivership was made permanent without any opposition.

In 1891, Union college in recognition of Mr. Brown's services to the State, conferred upon him the honorary degree of A. M.

In 1905 Mr. Brown became deeply interested in the work of Professor Chittenden, at Yale, who as a result of his experiments and investigation, broadly took the ground that much less food was required to maintain the body than was commonly supposed. He became an enthusiastic follower of Chittenden's ideas and also the theories advanced by Fletcher. As a result of his own investigation of the subject he published early in 1908 the work, "Scientific Nutrition Simplified," embodying the chief results of the investigations of Fletcher, Chittenden and others.

Mr. Brown is a manager of St. John's Hospital, of the Sprain Ridge Hospital, and a trustee of Prospect House, Yonkers; a member of the Society of Colonial Wars, of the Sons of the Revolution, of the orders of Founders and Patriots, of the Psi Upsilon Club of New York, of the Masonic fraternity and various other orders and societies.